

To be captains.

Mark W. Clark.
David S. Rumbough.
Francis J. Heraty.
Donovan Swanton.
Francis A. Macon, jr.
Laurence B. Keiser.
Homer C. Brown.
Clare H. Armstrong.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 26, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, we thank Thee that this is Thy world, that Thou art in it, ever ready to inspire, uphold, and guide those who seek Thee in spirit and in truth, in every laudable enterprise.

The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein:

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place?

He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.

The world is full of infidelity, atheism, materialism. All sorts of wild speculations are rife; and good men, strong men, wise and holy men, are called upon from the fountain of life to assert themselves and follow the precepts and example of the world's great Redeemer, to be purified, ennobled, sanctified, if they would save it from disaster. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 24, and of Sunday, January 25, were read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the files the papers in the case of H. R. 9208, which I introduced in the Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse action having been taken thereon by the Committee on Military Affairs, to which it was referred.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw from the files papers in the case to which he refers. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, where do they go?

Mr. WHEELER. There was no action taken by the Military Committee on the case, and I simply ask to withdraw the papers from the files.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PENSION LAWS.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, by direction of that committee, reported the bill H. R. 12012, concerning the administration of the pension laws in claims for pension of persons who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War, and by the widows of such persons, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLANTON reserved all points of order on the bill.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I present the following resolution:
The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of a point of order, any section of the bill as reported; and, upon motion authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it shall be in order to insert in any part of the bill any provision reported as part of the bill and heretofore ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. After a bill has been submitted to the House, the House has resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering that bill, general debate has been had on the bill, the bill has been read for amendment under the five-minute rule, various provisions of the bill have been adopted, and there are still remaining portions of the bill left for consideration, I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in order

and not the province of the Rules Committee to come in at this stage of the legislation and make in order provisions of the bill which have gone out on points of order in Committee of the Whole, which is sought to be done in this case by the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the Committee on Rules has that privilege before the House acts on the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to hear the parliamentary inquiry; the gentleman can make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule is to enable the majority of the House to do what it wishes to do in the further consideration of the bill. It is a simple matter and follows the precedents of the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Has the steering committee decided that this is the best thing to do?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The steering committee has not consulted with the members of the Rules Committee, so far as I know.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said on Saturday that on all important questions they had finally reached an agreement. I wanted to know whether you were proceeding regularly or not, or whether you were proceeding without consulting the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think we are proceeding in the utmost harmony.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am afraid that you are acting too independently. Does the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] know that this rule is to be brought in?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He does.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. This rule was brought in for the reason that points of order have been made against a number of provisions carried in the bill for years by members of the minority side of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is true; the sole purpose is to continue legislation that has been found necessary in years past.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman from Kansas think that the Rules Committee is taking on a legislative function?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not at all. This is a question of procedure, a question of permitting the House to do what it wants to do over the objection of any single Member of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but any single Member has a right to make a point of order against an item that is not properly in the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; that is under the general rules of the House, but the Committee on Rules brings in a rule to change the general rules of the House for the specific purpose of enabling the House to do what it wants to do in this particular instance, notwithstanding the rules.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do not these gentlemen who are running this Foreign Affairs Committee get up a bill that is in order?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] could give a better answer to that question than I. He brought in bills of similar import to this during the time that he was chairman of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be true, but that is no answer—that somebody, somewhere, in the long lapse of years has done something that you want to imitate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In any event, it is the purpose of this rule to let the House do what it wishes with respect to the bill.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Sixty-fourth Congress, which was Democratic, presented the same rule for the Post Office bill, the Agricultural bill, the District bill, and one other.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. If you rely constantly on what the Democrats did in Congress, does the gentleman not think he ought

to bring in a resolution saying that the Democrats were dead right about all these things? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I just want to put the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], chairman of the Rules Committee, on notice with respect to all the other appropriation supply bills they are to bring in here. He would better get rules making all unlawful matters in order and keep the rules in his hip pocket, because I am going to make points of order against every single unlawful provision that appears in any and all of these appropriation bills.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, the gentleman from Kansas is always ready for the gentleman from Texas on matters of that kind.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Missouri, the leader of the minority, asked a question of the gentleman from Kansas, and the gentleman from Kansas referred him to me to answer the question. The question was why this bill was not so framed as to make all the items it carries in order. I would say to the gentleman that the bill has carried items that are subject to a point of order for many years—all of these items, so far as I know—but I believe they are meritorious appropriations and ought to be carried in the bill. And while the gentleman is legislating for the Committee on Foreign Affairs I think his committee ought to legislate to make these items permanent law, so that in the future these very meritorious appropriations would not be subject to the whim of any single Member of this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think it is only fair to state that during the time the Republicans were in the minority they did not make the points of order.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken about that. We wrestled here for days with points of order raised by the Republicans.

Mr. MONDELL. I think not with this bill.

Mr. FLOOD. With this bill; yes—the Diplomatic and Consular bill. I am not mistaken about that, because I had charge of the bill. I had a great deal of trouble getting the bill through on account of these points of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman suggests that this rule will give the Committee on Foreign Affairs an opportunity to permit the majority to vote upon such measures as they care to put in the bill. Would this include allowing a majority of the House, if they wish to do so, to attach Armenia and Georgia to the Persian legation and make the minister to Persia minister to Armenia and Georgia and Persia, so as to accord the same representation to Armenia and Georgia as they have given to Poland and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It would not be in order under this rule. We are making in order matters that have been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KITCHIN. Under the rule, what is going to become of the items that we have already passed over?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. On motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] these items will be reinserted in the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. And reread?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. GARD. Has that process ever been attempted before, where we have proceeded under the general rules of the House and ruled out certain items and then gone back under a special rule making the things in order?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, yes. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am always anxious to please my genial friend from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] when he makes inquiries as to my position in regard to matters. He asked whether the chairman of the steering committee had been consulted in regard to this rule.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I have very brief time and I am going to answer the gentleman's inquiry. The steering committee was consulted—at least the chairman of the steering committee was consulted, and while the chairman of the steering committee is entirely nonpartisan in his view of things, he is not averse to taking proper advantage of a situation thrust upon

him by the opposition. He was of opinion that it was not wise to bring a rule in, and so suggested to the gentlemen of this committee, whose bill was being shot to pieces by gentlemen belonging to the party of the administration. His opinion was that from a political standpoint the thing to do was to let the administration side of this House shoot this administration bill to pieces by points of order, if they wanted to do it. There is no pork in this bill; there is no local benefit served by this bill; there is no special class or community benefited by this bill. This is a Government bill—the Government bill, the administration bill of the Congress—having to do wholly with foreign affairs. I doubt if there is a Republican who will be affected by any of these appropriations. The men and women who are to be paid under these appropriations are Democrats, practically all of them.

The committee brought this bill in as the Democratic side has been bringing it in year after year, subject to points of order that were never made by the Republican side, and gentlemen on the Democratic side, from what motive I do not know and can not fathom, knowing that the items are meritorious, knowing that they are essential, knowing they are urged by their administration, nevertheless strike them out, in my opinion, some of them, not because gentlemen have examined the matter themselves and are informed in respect to the items but because somebody has told them that they are subject to points of order. Anyone that is allowed to get near enough can throw monkey wrenches into machinery. It does not require knowledge or information or brain power to throw monkey wrenches into the legislative machinery, as certain gentlemen on the Democratic side have been doing. If my advice were followed, there might not be any rule here, and every time a point of order was made on the administration side of this House I would have the attention of the country challenged to the fact that gentlemen were so unfair to their own Government and their own administration that they would not even give the House an opportunity to pass upon the validity and the virtue and propriety of these items.

That is what I should have done. But the committee did not agree with my view of it. Perhaps they took a more statesmanlike view of it than I did. I did not object to the rule being brought in. In fact, when the Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee expressed a desire for a rule I helped them get it. I think my view may have been a trifle partisan, because I would have challenged the attention of the country to the utterly indefensible attitude of certain gentlemen on the Democratic side relative to this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly very much surprised and disappointed at the position which my collaborator and, I might say, partner in economy, the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], has taken in his remarks. I never thought for one moment that when I went "in cahoots" with him some time ago to put through an economy program that he and myself would ever part company, and that he would ever get so indignant and excited and red faced over the matter. But I see that he has changed his views on economy. He is not going to have any "program of economy" from now on. But I was gratified to hear from him that there is one committee of this House—the Rules Committee—that is not going to tolerate any overlordism from the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. He says he told the Rules Committee not to report out this rule; to let these Democrats and everybody else make all the points of order they wanted. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the other members of the Rules Committee, perhaps, said, "No; you can boss the Ways and Means Committee and humiliate Chairman FORDNEY and Mr. GREEN of Iowa; you can make the Naval Committee bend the knee; you can make the Rivers and Harbors Committee tremble with fear and do your bidding; but here is one committee, Mr. MONDELL," says Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, "here is one committee that you dare not and can not bulldoze; you shall not be their master. I know you do not want us to report this out, but we are going to do it in spite of you." Do you not imagine that Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas talked that way to him?

I am glad we have one committee that is independent of Mr. MONDELL and the steering committee. Let me tell the gentleman from Wyoming that I was absolutely sincere, of course [laughter], on Saturday when I came down expecting to have the hearty cooperation of the gentleman. I never made but one point of order, and it was against an item, I think, of \$400,000. I made a point of order but reserved it in order for the chairman to

enlighten the House; I made and reserved the point of order trying to get a reduction in the item down to \$250,000. Mr. MONDELL was not in the House at the time, and I took it that he was absolutely sincere and conscientious on the economy program, and I said, "Here, before the war, even up to 1917, we only appropriated \$150,000 for that item, and surely we ought to cut it down and appropriate not over \$250,000, a year and a half after the armistice." Looking around and seeing the gentleman was not here, and knowing he would have made the point of order if he had been here and that we would have cooperated together, I made the point of order and I tried to reduce the item. I told the chairman if he would reduce it to \$250,000 I would not make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman might have made a motion to reduce the item, and I might have, but he will have an opportunity to make a motion to reduce the item now, and I want him to do it if he is here.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will take the gentleman's place and do it if he is not here. I know the gentleman was sincere in saying that he is opposed to this rule. If he will help fight it, he will defeat it. I want to ask him, since he is opposed to the rule, against it for politics and against it because of the injustice of the rule, is he going to help fight it? Is he going to make a speech against this rule and ask these Republicans to vote against it?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say I was against it.

Mr. KITCHIN. You said you opposed it, as the notes will show, and if you had your way you would let the Democrats or anybody else make all the points of order they wanted. If you stand up to that, you will defeat this rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that the Democratic members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs raised no point of order against this bill; that none of them reserved the right to raise points of order against it, and they did not do it. The only criticism made here by minority members of that committee was in the fact that an attempt was made to claim great economy on this bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and myself called attention to that fact. But we were for this bill and all the items in it.

Another thing I want to call attention to is the fact that gentlemen on the other side have said that no points of order were made or reserved against this bill by gentlemen on that side during the eight years when the bill was in charge of a committee the majority of whom were Democrats. That is not according to the record at all. Points of order were made or reserved against it, and we wrestled here with Republicans day after day in order to get this bill in such shape that it would satisfy the demands of the department and supply our foreign service with the means sufficient to run and develop in accordance with the best interests of this country.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Was it ever necessary to bring in a rule to make any of the provisions of the bill in order?

Mr. FLOOD. No; because we worked along with the bill in the House as best we could, and when it went to the Senate items were frequently reinserted, and the bill was made a law in a proper and orderly way, and not by rules brought in by the Rules Committee. But the Republicans during the consideration of this bill raised or made more points of order when I was chairman of the committee than have been raised against this bill at this time. There were more items against which points of order were raised or made each year of those eight years than have been raised or made during the consideration of this bill by this House.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], in reply to a question asked him, stated that all of these appropriations, eliminated on points of order, would be put back into the bill by the chairman moving to reconsider these sections that had been passed, indicating that it had already been determined by the few men on the Rules Committee what the whole House of Representatives had to do; and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] states that all these points of order were made by Members who were

merely told that the sections were subject to points of order, indicating that they would not have known it if they had not been told.

The gentleman from Wyoming is so used to telling his colleagues on his side of the House what he wants done and what should be done, and having them do it without any question, that he imagines that everybody else on the other side of the House is so controlled. Now, the amounts that were cut out of this bill on points of order were the following: On page 3, the sum of \$134,000; on page 4, the sum of \$438,000; on page 5, the sum of \$15,000, and the sums of \$2,000, \$9,000, and \$1,200; and on page 6, \$15,000 and \$2,000. They are the items. One of these points of order was made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KIRCHIN], and all of the other points of order were made by me, and by same over \$630,000 was temporarily saved to the people of the United States.

I want to submit to my friend from Wyoming, the distinguished leader of the majority, that true economy is more than lip deep; it is more than skin deep. If he wants to save these sums, what must be done? What are these sums of money for? Why, to pay so-called student interpreters, 10 of them to China, a salary of \$1,500 a year each, for what? To learn how to go to school over there and learn the Chinese language. Not only that, but \$200 apiece is appropriated to pay for their tuition. Not only that, but \$600 a year is appropriated for their quarters. And so it is with respect to Turkey. Ten students are paid \$1,500 a year each, and \$200 for tuition and \$600 for quarters. And so it is with Japan. Those students are paid \$1,500 a year each to go to school. You pay them to go to school over there, and pay for their quarters \$600, and pay for their tuition \$200 each; and these are the sums of money that are taken out of the people's Treasury in this crucial time. With a deficit of \$3,000,000,000 staring us in the face, you are paying fellows to go to school in China and Japan and Turkey, and after you educate them over there they will come right back to the United States and commercialize the education we have paid for, and we will get no service whatever from them. There is absolutely nothing that binds them to the service. There is absolutely nothing that guarantees to the United States of America one single dollar of value for the money expended. I want to say that the so-called economy on the majority side of the House is lip deep only.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kansas yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I just came in and was told that this rule was being considered. As I understand the rule, it does not pass anything but gives the House an opportunity to reject or approve. Is that correct?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the purpose of the rule. The purpose of the rule is to give the House the opportunity to consider the items reported in this bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CANNON. And the strenuous effort of the gentleman from Texas is to seek to take from the House that privilege?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I assume that is the purpose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, while the chairman of the Committee on Rules is on his feet I would like to ask him a question. Does this rule make in order the Irish resolution about freedom for Ireland?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was not referred to in the rule. [Laughter.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would state that the gentleman has six minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to maintain a fight on this floor which can not be sustained. The situation before the Committee on Rules was this: The information we received was that this bill came with a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs; that there was no division of opinion as to the legislation this bill embodies.

For my part I could not imagine just how I could oppose a rule for the consideration of the bill under those circumstances. I must say the rule itself is not drawn as I would have drawn it. Nevertheless, it does bring this legislation before the House. It leaves the bill open for amendment. If the House wishes to reduce any of the items, it can do so by a majority vote. But when one of the great committees of the House asks for a resolution providing for the consideration of a measure, and the information is the bill has a unanimous report, and, moreover, that the bill is a practical redraft of legislation which

was passed by a Democratic Congress, I could not see just how to inaugurate a fight against the rule. Therefore I do not see how I can oppose this rule, and I shall vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, having been on this committee and having attended the hearings for the purpose of determining the amounts that should be incorporated for the various items in this bill, and being most obstreperous on the point of appropriating vast sums of money, I feel that I would like to say a word on this question.

I want to call the attention of the minority side of the House to this fact—and it was the argument that brought me to agree to some of the items in the bill, else I most certainly would have been the obstreperous one on the floor of the House to cut them down. That argument, urged by the Secretary of State and his assistants who appeared before the committee, was this: In order that the Secretary of State and the foreign relations department might function adequately and efficiently at this time, it was necessary to maintain at least a semblance of flexibility in the law, and it would be impossible for the State Department to meet the varying conditions in the European countries at this time, with their unstable governments or unestablished governments in many of the States; it would be impossible for them to meet the conditions arising if the law were drafted with rigid and stringent provisions and held to a certain line. On that plea, and that plea alone, I agreed to many of these items in this bill. As to the question of economy, it has been bandied back and forth about whether we are saving money or not. I want to say to the minority that if I had it my way there would not be any question of doubt about whether we were saving money. I think we are appropriating money in this bill in certain places for which it is questionable whether we will ever get value received. Most certainly, in the light of the way that past appropriations for similar items have been expended, the United States Government has been caused some embarrassment because of mistakes made in our secret diplomacy. I am not in favor of that kind of legislation. I am not in favor of lump sums; but when the Secretary of State at this time, with the affairs of the world as critical as they are, comes before me and says that it is more necessary that this bill carry these items, and in the amounts in which they are carried, than it was during the war, it is not up to me to say that I know more about conditions in Russia or Germany or France or any other country than the men whom your minority party have selected to act in that capacity. I want to appeal to the Democratic side, to ask you, Have you not the same confidence in the men selected by your chief in permitting them to expend this money that we on this side have? I agree with the gentleman in toto that when we get back to normal conditions we ought to establish a law that would not require the President of the United States to have more than \$1,000,000 to spend as he sees fit, to parcel out where he will, to confer favors on whom he will. I am opposed to that kind of legislation, and I want to go on record as saying so.

There is another thing to which I wish to call attention in this particular proposition. The Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, testified before our committee that even with this appropriation, as big as it is, it is not big enough to permit him and the Chief Executive to go out into the highways and byways of life and select men because of their particular qualifications to fill these offices. On the other hand, he testified that before he could select a man to represent this Government in a foreign court, because of the inadequate pay and the enormous expenditures to which these men are put, it is necessary for him to go only into the class of the idle rich to make his selections.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield another minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I want to appeal not only to the minority side but to the majority side. I have no quarrel with a man because he is rich. I wish I were. But I want to ask you if you believe the Government of the United States, a Republic, as it is, can best function when the selection of its representatives for foreign diplomacy is confined to a class of individuals who have already amassed their fortunes? I believe that this Congress, or if not this Congress then the next one, could make no better move than to reorganize our foreign-affairs department in such a way that we can select men to represent us in foreign countries not because of the dollar mark that they may wear but because of their individual and particular fitness for that position. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. Does this bill make any provision for increasing the salaries of our diplomatic and consular representatives?

Mr. BEGG. It does not, because it was thought, both by the Secretary of State and by the committee, to be unwise to undertake to do that at this time; and my reason for introducing that thought is to make clear that I am one man who believes that we are appropriating not too much money in some of these amounts, but appropriating it in the wrong way.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think it is an unfortunate thing for our brethren of the majority that they have returned to the practice of running the House by special rules, rather than under the general rules provided in the manual. When I first came to Congress some years ago, the practice of special rules was in vogue, and it is a matter of history that that policy was exceedingly disastrous to the Republican Party. Apparently that policy is to be revived.

Some weeks ago the conferees on the agricultural bill brought in a report which, like this bill, represented an excess of authority, so that the House conferees had to appeal to the Rules Committee for a rule to make in order the illegal matter in their report. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in presenting the report of the Rules Committee very clearly indicated that he did not approve of the rule, and intimated in substance that in the future the committees which brought in bills containing matter in excess of their authority need not appeal to the Rules Committee over which he presided, for authority to make this illegal matter in order. The situation to-day duplicates the plight in which the conferees on the agricultural bill found themselves. When the conferees on that bill undertook to include matter that was subject to a point of order, such an undertaking was an illegal assumption of authority. When the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or any other committee, undertakes to make appropriations not justified by law, that undertaking is an illegal assumption of authority on their part. There is no difference whatever in principle between the grounds on which a rule has been asked for this bill, and the grounds on which the rule was asked in the case of the agricultural bill. The Members of this body will recall very distinctly the attitude assumed by our friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the chairman of the Rules Committee, on the occasion referred to. I have his remarks before me and if time permitted I would cite them in full.

Mr. Speaker, just as I was coming into the Hall of the House I heard the leader on the Republican side [Mr. MONDELL] say that anybody could throw monkey wrenches into the machinery. Does he think that points of order that are so clear that they are sustained by the Presiding Officer without argument are monkey wrenches thrown into orderly legislative procedure? What is the purpose of our rules save to provide the paths in which the committees of the House must walk? Any committee which exceeds its authority is subject to a point of order when it does so.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. A little later. May I call the attention of this body to the fact that a few days ago, when the Post Office bill was under consideration and an item was reached which was in the interests of the farmers residing on rural routes, and which carried an appropriation of \$300,000 for the development of local business, in the interest of the producer and the consumer, it was a Republican—Mr. TINCER, of Kansas—who threw a monkey wrench into the machinery by making a point of order to that item, and thereby causing it to be stricken from the bill. I have not as yet been advised that the Committee on Rules have been willing to report a rule to give the House an opportunity to vote on that particular proposition. [Applause.]

That is not all in this connection, Mr. Speaker. Not only does this rule undertake to make in order everything remaining in the bill—and there is no more reason why this should be done as to this appropriation bill than in the case of any other bill of like character—but it is actually retroactive, and makes it in order for all the matter that was stricken out on Saturday, on points of order, to be replaced in the bill on motion.

Mr. Speaker, I undertake to say that every committee of this House should conform to the rules of this House. When the Democrats were in power they did not report rules of this sweeping character providing that the contents of an entire bill should be in order. Certainly none of these rules were

retroactive. In a few cases when it was exceedingly desirable that certain legislation should be attached to an appropriation bill, rules were adopted making their provisions in order. [Applause.]

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. GARD. I desire to know whether the rule goes so far as to abrogate the call of the Calendar of the District of Columbia without the intervention of a motion?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; that question will arise on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question raised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], the identical provision to which he objects was reported from the Rules Committee by Mr. Dalzell, and is found in Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3262.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that there were a great many rules in this House reported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dalzell.

Mr. FESS. In reference to the practice of legislating by the Rules Committee, I have just looked over the Record and find that in the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, which was a Democratic Congress, we had this rule in the Post Office bill, in the naval bill, in the District bill, in the Agricultural bill, and in the fortification bill. That was a Democratic Congress.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand there were special items in the bills which the rules referred to, but does the gentleman mean to say that the rules were as sweeping as this and retroactive?

Mr. FESS. Not retroactive, but as sweeping in making the whole bill in order. Now, in reference to the matter referred to by the ex-chairman of the committee, Mr. Flood, I want to say that I was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for one Congress, during which time there were appropriation bills reported. I remember that Mr. Stafford, of Wisconsin, offered some objection. I have looked over the Record of the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and I find that he reserved points of order in five different instances, and in all but one withdrew the point of order. The point of order was not made in any case except one. That is found on page 1887 of the Record of the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session. The point of order went to the proviso which referred to the payment of certain employees here in the District of Columbia. It did not have anything to do with appropriations, but rather to the administration of them. That point of order was made and sustained, and that was the only item of the bill, so far as I can find, which was disturbed on a point of order. Consequently, while I do not care to enter into this part of the controversy, it does seem to me that it is a rather far-fetched statement that this bill has been obstructed in years before by the intervention of points of order which were made when the fact is they were rather merely reserved and were later withdrawn. I simply want to make that statement for the Record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have some citations which I wish to put in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks by inserting the points in controversy in the Sixty-fifth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the matter referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. The only points of order raised on this bill will be found on page 1846, by Stafford; 1847, Connelly; 1886, to the proviso, by Stafford; 1887, by Stafford. All save the proviso were withdrawn.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put in points of order made against the bill in the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, and Sixty-fourth Congresses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the Sixty-third Congress there was a rule brought in on the Diplomatic bill, but it was not pressed, and later on was withdrawn.

Mr. FLOOD. That was about a particular item, and did not cover the whole bill. It referred to the building of embassies and legations.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman recall that in the last Congress the Post Office appropriation bill was brought in with a lot of legislation in it, and that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] got unanimous consent of the House that all of the provisions should be considered in order?

Mr. FESS. I remember that very distinctly. The only reason I rose to make this statement was to clarify the matter, and the statement that the Republicans attempted to obstruct the bill on the matter of specific appropriations, which I did not remember was the case, and which the Record clearly shows was not the case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he is undertaking to make it appear that a Member of the House is acting in a disorderly sort of a way in raising points of order against an item in the bill that would go out by the decision of anybody in the chair?

Mr. FESS. I do not, for the simple reason that salaries for certain lines in the Diplomatic and Consular Service under the jurisdiction of this committee have not been permanent, and anyone could get up and make a point of order to item after item. I do not think that displays any particular prescient genius or any special patriotism.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nobody said that it did, but what I want to know is if it is to be considered bad form for anybody to raise a point of order against an item that is not authorized by law?

Mr. FESS. Certainly it is not bad form.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am going to vote for this rule, but I do not like this insinuation that Members are acting in bad form if they exercise their undoubted rights.

Mr. FESS. I think my friend, the ex-Speaker, will vindicate the action of the Rules Committee in bringing in a rule making these items in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am going to vote for the rule.

Mr. GARNER. Ought not the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to say to the Foreign Affairs Committee and to the various committees of the House when they come in with appropriation bills and find them slaughtered, and more than one-half or a third of them stricken out on points of order, that they ought to take cognizance of that and go back to their committee room and draft legislation that will make these things in order in the future?

Mr. FESS. I would say to my friend that I am willing to report a rule to make this permanent, provided the Rules Committee cares to do that.

Mr. GARNER. I do not think that that would be good legislation.

Mr. FESS. We have done it before.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I have any objection to this procedure, it is that the Committee on Rules appears to be reaching out and absorbing and usurping the authority of other committees in this House.

Mr. FESS. The Rules Committee simply reports to the House for its final decision. If its reports are not proper or objectionable, the House can reject the report. The purpose is to insure such legislation as is demanded to continue the operations of the Government. This particular rule is to continue the work of the State Department, and it was made necessary by the tactics employed to defeat the proposed legislation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have no apology to make for bringing in this rule or any other rule that has been brought in by the committee during this Congress. I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for a number of years, and my recollection is very distinct that for eight years prior to the beginning of this session of Congress we brought in rules here every few days to make items in order on appropriation bills. It is not necessary to recite them. The Record is full of them.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman that in a number of instances under Democratic administration rules have been brought in for the purpose of making items in order, but now the gentleman with his long experience on that committee ought to call the attention of those various committees to the fact,

when they ask for these rules, that they had a rule a year ago and have so far neglected to submit to the House legislation that would make the particular items in order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Clearly then it is not the fault of the Committee on Rules that they are appealed to to enable the House to do what it wishes to do with respect to certain matters in appropriation bills.

Mr. GARNER. But the Committee on Rules has it within its power to give these various statutes consideration, and if you continue to give these committees the rules there will be no occasion for them to report a law to make these appropriations in order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What I have said refers to items in appropriation bills, that in a way properly belong in such bills.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me that all this is leather and prunella, especially when the leader of the minority says that he is going to vote for the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] refers to some remarks that I made on a special rule making in order some legislation on the Agricultural appropriation bill. I would repeat every word that I said then, if it were necessary to do so. I am opposed to riders on appropriation bills, and I think the warning given at that time has been heeded. We have had few requests recently to make riders in order on appropriation bills. I adhere to every word that I said on that occasion, but when it is necessary to make in order items in an appropriation bill that would enable the particular branch of the Government to function that is being appropriated for, that raises an entirely different question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman stated it was a rider in the case to which I referred, but that was the case of a conference committee that exceeded its authority.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In putting a matter on an appropriation bill that had not been considered by either House.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. They exceeded their authority.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was legislation.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. When committees exceed their authority with respect to appropriating money for things, for which there is no law, is not that an excess of authority and is not that a rider?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, no; it is not so regarded.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. The gentleman from Kansas was interrogated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] as to whether or not this rule takes into consideration the Irish question. I presume he referred to the Mason resolution. I want to know if the chairman will permit an amendment to this rule now to take into consideration the Mason resolution, so that it may be brought before the membership of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The matter was not incorporated in the bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Rules does not take jurisdiction of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the House having divided, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 311, nays 9, answered "present" 2, not voting 106, as follows:

YEAS—311.

Ackerman	Barkley	Box	Burdick
Almon	Bee	Brand	Burke
Anderson	Begg	Briggs	Burroughs
Andrews, Nebr.	Bell	Brinson	Butler
Anthony	Benson	Britten	Byrnes, S. C.
Ashbrook	Black	Brooks, Ill.	Byrnes, Tenn.
Aswell	Blackmon	Brooks, Pa.	Campbell, Kans.
Ayres	Bland, Ind.	Browne	Campbell, Pa.
Baer	Bland, Mo.	Browning	Cannon
Bankhead	Bland, Va.	Brumbaugh	Cantrill
Barbour	Bowers	Buchanan	Carss

Carter	Harrison	MacCrate	Schall
Chindblom	Hastings	MacGregor	Shreve
Clark, Fla.	Hawley	Madden	Siegel
Clark, Mo.	Hays	Magee	Sims
Classon	Heflin	Maher	Sinclair
Coady	Hernandez	Major	Sinnott
Cole	Hersey	Mansfield	Sisson
Collier	Hersman	Mapes	Slomp
Connally	Hickey	Mays	Small
Crago	Hicks	Mead	Smith, Idaho
Crisp	Hill	Merritt	Smith, Ill.
Crowther	Hoch	Michener	Smith, Mich.
Cullen	Hoey	Miller	Smithwick
Currie, Mich.	Holland	Minahan, N. J.	Stedman
Curry, Calif.	Huddleston	Monahan, Wis.	Steenerson
Dale	Hudspeth	Mondell	Stephens, Ohio
Dallinger	Hulings	Montague	Stevenson
Darrow	Hull, Iowa	Mooney	Stinnes
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Va.	Strong, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Humphreys	Moore, Ind.	Strong, Pa.
Dempsey	Husted	Morgan	Summers, Wash.
Denison	Igoe	Mott	Summers, Tex.
Dent	Ireland	Murphy	Sweet
Dickinson, Mo.	Jacoway	Nelson, Mo.	Swope
Dickinson, Iowa	James	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Ark.
Dominick	Johnson, Ky.	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Doremus	Johnson, Miss.	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Tenn.
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor	Temple
Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Ogden	Thompson
Drane	Jones, Pa.	Oldfield	Tillman
Dunbar	Juni	Oliver	Tilson
Dupré	Kearns	Overstreet	Timberlake
Eagan	Keller	Padgett	Timcher
Echols	Kelly, Pa.	Paige	Tinkham
Elston	Kendall	Park	Towner
Emerson	Kiess	Parker	Treadway
Esch	King	Parrish	Upshaw
Evans, Mont.	Kinkaid	Pell	Vaile
Evans, Nebr.	Kitchin	Peters	Vare
Evans, Nev.	Klecza	Platt	Venable
Fairfield	Kraus	Porter	Vestal
Fess	Lampert	Pou	Vinson
Fisher	Langley	Purnell	Volgt
Flood	Lanham	Quin	Walsh
Focht	Lankford	Radcliffe	Walters
Fordney	Layton	Rainey, Ala.	Ward
Frear	Lazaro	Rainey, H. T.	Weaver
Freeman	Lea, Calif.	Raker	Webster
French	Lee, Ga.	Ramsey	Welling
Fuller, Ill.	Lehibach	Ramseyer	Welty
Fuller, Mass.	Little	Randall, Calif.	Wheeler
Gallagher	Loneragan	Randall, Wis.	White, Kans.
Gallivan	Longworth	Rayburn	White, Me.
Ganly	Luce	Reavis	Williams
Garland	Lufkin	Reber	Wilson, Ill.
Garner	McAndrews	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ia.
Glynn	McArthur	Rhodes	Wilson, Pa.
Good	McClintic	Ricketts	Wingo
Goodwin, Ark.	McDuffie	Riddick	Winslow
Goodykoontz	McFadden	Robinson, N. C.	Wise
Green, Iowa	McGlennon	Robison, Ky.	Woods, Va.
Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Rodenberg	Wright
Griest	McKeown	Rogers	Yates
Hadley	McKiniry	Rose	Young, N. Dak.
Hardy, Colo.	McLane	Rubey	Young, Tex.
Hardy, Tex.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rucker	Zihlman
Harrell	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, Ind.	

NAYS—9.

Bakka	Kincheloe	Saunders, Va.	Steagall
Blanton	Rainey, J. W.	Sherwood	Thomas
Gard			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Griffin Rouse

NOT VOTING—106.

Andrews, Md.	Fields	Kreider	Rowan
Bacharach	Foster	Larsen	Rowe
Benham	Gandy	Lasher	Sabath
Boies	Garrett	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Booher	Godwin, N. C.	Luhning	Sanders, N. Y.
Caldwell	Goldfogle	McCulloch	Sanford
Candler	Goodall	McKinley	Scott
Caraway	Gould	McPherson	Scully
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Mann, Ill.	Sears
Casey	Graham, Ill.	Mann, S. C.	Sells
Christopherson	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Smith, N. Y.
Cleary	Hamill	Mason	Snell
Cooper	Hamilton	Moon	Snyder
Copley	Haugen	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Costello	Hayden	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Cramton	Houghton	Mudd	Stoll
Davey	Howard	Neely	Sullivan
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Newton, Minn.	Tague
Donovav	Jefferis	Nicholls, S. C.	Volstead
Doolling	Johnston, N. Y.	Nolan	Wason
Dunn	Jones, Tex.	O'Connell	Watkins
Dyer	Kahn	Olney	Watson
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Osborne	Whaley
Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Phelan	Wood, Ind.
Elliott	Kennedy, R. I.	Reed, W. Va.	Woodyard
Ellsworth	Kettner	Riordan	
Ferris	Knutson	Romjue	

So the rule was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. TAGUE.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
 Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. DEWALT.
 Mr. KAHN with Mr. FIELDS.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. KETTNER.
 Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. OLNEY.
 Mr. DUNN with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. PHELAN.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. LUHRING with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. GOODALL with Mr. CASEY.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. HAYDEN.
 Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. GANDY.
 Mr. EDMUNDS with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
 Mr. MASON with Mr. JONES of Texas.
 Mr. NOLAN with Mr. GARRETT.
 Mr. WOODS of Indiana with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. ROMJUE.
 Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. CLEARY.
 Mr. FOSTER with Mr. STOLL.
 Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. COOPER with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. LARSEN.
 Mr. WASON with Mr. HOWARD.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. CAREY.
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. LINTHICUM.
 Mr. SCOTT with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. LESSEE.
 Mr. VOLSTEAD with Mr. NEELY.
 Mr. SNELL with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. WATKINS.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular bill, H. R. 11960.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11960, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee adjourned on Saturday night the committee was dividing on the item on line 24, page 6.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that we return to page 3, line 7, in order to insert the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to return is not necessary. The rule provides that it is in order to amend the bill at any place; so the thing to do would be to offer an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the rule adopted by the House, did it not make merely in order any provision in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the rule to the gentleman. It says:

Resolved, That during the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of a point of order, any section of the bill as reported, and, upon motion authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it shall be in order to insert in any part of the bill any provision reported as part of the bill and heretofore ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. In the first part, where it says "upon motion authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs," does not that require a motion to return to a particular section to insert? I submit a point of order that it does require a motion to return

to any particular section, and then the committee has a right to offer to insert.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman is wrong and that his point of order is not well taken. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 3, line 7, after the figures "1916," insert: "Provided, That secretaries in the Diplomatic Service shall hereafter be graded and classified as follows: Secretaries of class 1, \$4,000 per annum; secretaries of class 2, \$3,625 per annum; secretaries of class 3, \$3,000 per annum; secretaries of class 4, \$2,500 per annum."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask my colleagues not to let us deceive ourselves about the status of the present situation before the House. Under the point of order which was held good by the Chair the amount of \$134,000 of annual increases for the employees mentioned in this paragraph, not authorized by any law in the world, was eliminated from the bill. Why, if this amendment offered by the chairman of this committee is passed, it just simply means this, that each and every year until changed there will be taken out of the Treasury of the United States this \$134,000 of increases annually in salaries.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. ROGERS. The point the gentleman makes will not be changed by my suggestion, but the fact is that there are 135 secretaries contemplated—

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield for that. I do not yield at all for that kind of stuff, because it means this, and the gentleman knows it, that it is an increase of salaries of \$134,000 a year that is not authorized by any law on the statute books.

You talk about economy in one breath, the economy policy of the dominant party in this House, and then your dominant party in another breath wastes and unlawfully appropriates hundreds of thousands of dollars, a policy that means economy that is only lip deep. There was nearly \$650,000 stricken out of this bill on last Saturday on points of order, made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and myself, because there was no law sustaining them. Now, my friends on this side of the aisle have brought in a gag rule here to make each and every one of these items in order. You can not fool the people at all. You can not fool the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee [Mr. GOOD], because he really has a sure enough case of economy on him, like I have.

And he is sincere in wanting to save the people money. But you will not stand by him. You are going to put back into this bill \$650,000 which is to be taken out of the Treasury each year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I could not refuse to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. What was the vote on the adoption of the rule? I was out of the Chamber at the time.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, there were just a few that would stand by their own judgment and vote against that rule. I admit it. But I can tell the gentleman that there was one who voted against it, because I voted against it.

Mr. CANNON. Somebody tells me that were nine who did not want the rule, but the House was unanimous outside of that.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; under the party whip on that side and under the party whip on this side they were almost unanimous. But I am one of those who, as the gentleman knows, does not respond to the party whip unless it is on a question of party policy decided by caucus. When it is on a question of needlessly taking money out of the Treasury and wasting it, there is no party whip in the world that will whip me into line.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Hooray!

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; you can "hooray," and when the people find out that you voted to take \$650,000 out of the Treasury for the next year and needlessly waste it, a part of which is to educate young fellows in China and Turkey and Japan and let them come back here and sell the education they received from the Treasury of the United States to commercial institutions, your people will say "hooray," too, when you ask them to send you back to office. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in a sincere desire to economize. I am one of the Democrats who will stand shoulder to shoulder with him and help him keep people's fingers out of the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I know that there are three economists in this House—one the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and one the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and myself. [Laughter.] I want to suggest to the gentleman from Wyoming that here is one of the items where he can help me and Mr. BLANTON save some money to the Government. I am really opposed to these increased salaries for the secretaries, and I am sincere in it—

Mr. GOOD. Mostly [laughter]—

Mr. KITCHIN. And am opposed to this amendment. If you defeat this amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, then the salaries of the secretaries remain just as they have been since 1915, according to the present law. During the war we did not increase these salaries. In 1916 we did not increase their salaries, and in 1917, 1918, and 1919 we did not increase the salaries. Even for this current fiscal year we did not increase the salaries of the secretaries. But now this amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania increases the secretaries' salaries \$1,000 each, or a total increase of \$130,000. This is a new increase, never carried before in any act.

Now, we ought not to do that. I want you, gentlemen of the House, every one of you here who is going to vote on this question, to know that this increase of a thousand dollars to each secretary is not because the cost of living has increased. It is not to take care of the advancing cost of living. It has never been intimated by the Secretary of State that that is the reason why he wanted these salaries increased, because in the post-allowance fund of \$600,000 in the bill the increased cost of living is met. That fund has been used to increase the salaries, in addition to the bonus, to these secretaries, to meet the increasing cost of living. That is one of the purposes of this post-allowance fund of \$600,000 which is in the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. May not the increase be provided for in anticipation of the raising of the standard of living on account of the League of Nations going into effect?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; it may be, but I should not think so. But if so, you provide for that. You provide this \$600,000 post fund for that, and the chairman will tell you that that is true. So that, gentlemen, this increase now at this late date is not to enable the salaries of these secretaries to keep pace with the high cost of living.

The only reason in the world which the Secretary of State gives is to enable these secretaries of the ambassadors to go into good society, into "tango" and "kow-tow" society. [Laughter.] He says here in the report:

As the lieutenants of the ambassadors and ministers, the secretaries must be able to mingle with all classes of people and associate upon a plane of equality with the members of the highest social and official circles of the capitals in which they are located.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Is not that caused by the fact that the social standard was set so high by the members of the peace commission and the social dignitaries that went to Paris? [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. That is possible; it is very possible that the committee has anticipated that, and taken care of it. But Mr. Lansing does not ask for it, except to permit these secretaries to meet and mingle socially with the kings and queens and monarchs, the princes and princesses, and the lords and ladies of Europe and have them tango and kow-tow around with royalty; not to perform their duties in the office. [Laughter.] It may be that that is where the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] gets the idea in his head, which he expressed on Saturday, that the American ambassadors are really figureheads; that they do not do anything except do the society act, and the secretaries have been doing the work. Now, the Secretary of State wants the secretaries to do the "society act" and let the ambassadors do the work. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. You can call this increase of salaries for secretaries a tango increase. You can vote for it if you want to. But you can save \$130,000 in that item, that has not been carried before, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] ought, in good conscience, to help defeat the amendment

of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If it were to keep pace with the increased cost of living we would all vote for it. But they not only get the bonus, but this \$600,000 fund enables the Secretary of State to increase salaries, so as to provide for the increased cost of living. That is put in there for that purpose.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think the secretary of a legation or an embassy should receive a salary of only \$1,500 a year?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know about that. If it was all that he needed in 1915, when we increased the salary to that figure, then it is enough now. You all voted for \$1,500 then. That is what is paid to the little fellows—the little secretaries. Some of them get \$3,000. If it was enough in 1915, when Congress considered the question of increase of their salaries, it is all they need now. If it was all they needed in 1916, it is all they need now. If it was all they needed in 1917 and 1918 and 1919, while the war was going on, it is all they need now. What got this tango-society idea into the head of the Secretary of State?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The Secretary of State belongs to the gentleman's party. He is closer to the Secretary of State than I am.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the reason the committee gives. Does the gentleman really believe a \$1,500 clerk increased up to \$2,500 will be enabled to circle on an equality with kings and queens and lords and ladies—to make a social hit in the royal society?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman want an answer to that question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Will it enable him to do it?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I want to say to the gentleman that I think a man who is competent to hold a position as secretary of legation or secretary of embassy can not fulfill any of the functions of the position on a salary of \$1,500 a year.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is that one of the functions of this \$1,500 clerk or secretary, to go in this high diplomatic and royal society?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am not saying anything about his going into society. An American secretary of legation ought to receive more than \$1,500 a year.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Secretary of State puts it on that ground, and that alone. Most of the secretaries receive in salary, bonuses, and so forth, two or three and in some instances nearly four times as much.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. But he ought to be entitled to live like an American citizen.

Mr. KITCHIN. We give them that bonus, and in the \$600,000 fund all the increased cost of living is provided for. Now, I want the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to help me save this \$130,000. It is one of the items on which he can well afford to join hands with me, and I hope he will.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman for a moment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to say to the gentleman who has just been questioning you that when the State Department asked for the enactment of a law in 1915 he fixed this salary at \$1,500.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. In the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for 1918 did not the gentleman from Virginia recommend an increase in these salaries?

Mr. FLOOD. We did.

Mr. KITCHIN. And Congress refused to grant it; and that is what Congress ought to do right now.

Mr. PORTER. Did not the gentleman from Virginia also ask an increase of these salaries for the current year?

Mr. KITCHIN. And Congress refused to grant it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 42, noes 19.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to return to page 3, line 16, and insert the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, insert the following paragraphs:
 "Chinese assistant secretary of legation to China, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000.
 "Japanese assistant secretary of embassy to Japan, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000.
 "Turkish assistant secretary of embassy to Turkey, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 40, noes 2.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the RECORD, I call attention of the Chair to the fact that on page 3, line 12, the words and figures "in all, \$418,375," did not go out on the point of order Saturday, although the RECORD indicates that they did. Therefore the enrolling clerk should make sure that those words and figures appear in the bill when enrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that lines 16 to 20, on page 3 of the bill, were not stricken out on the point of order, and the offering of the first part of the amendment appears to be superfluous. No point of order was made against those lines so far as the Chair knows. Lines 21, 22, and 23, on page 3, went out on a point of order, but lines 16 to 20, inclusive, did not.

Mr. ROGERS. If the Chair will turn to page 2016 of the RECORD of Saturday, he will find the following:

The Clerk read as follows:

"Japanese assistant secretary of embassy to Japan, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000.

"Turkish assistant secretary of embassy to Turkey, to be appointed from the corps of student interpreters, \$2,000."

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no law providing for this assistant secretary.

There are three paragraphs, beginning with line 16 and ending with line 23, each of which deals with the appropriations for assistant secretaries. And while it is not entirely clear that the point of order of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] relates to the first or even to the second, it seemed to the chairman of the committee [Mr. PORTER] and myself when we went over it this morning that it was sufficiently in doubt so that the safest way was to offer the amendment which the gentleman did offer.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts the Chair will state that the point of order was raised against the last paragraph, lines 21 to 23, inclusive, and did not include the paragraphs in line 16 to 20. Those two paragraphs remain in the bill. The only ones that were stricken out were the ones embraced in lines 21 to 23; so that it will be in order for the gentleman to ask to vacate the action taken on his amendment.

Mr. PORTER. I ask unanimous consent that the action of the committee be corrected so as to leave the bill as it stood when introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to restore lines 21 to 23, inclusive, on page 3 instead of covering the lines from 16 to 23 on that page. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLERKS AT EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

For the employment of necessary clerks at the embassies and legations, who, whenever hereafter appointed, shall be citizens of the United States, \$438,000; and so far as practicable shall be appointed under civil service rules and regulations.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to keep the RECORD straight as we go along. This item of \$438,000 was eliminated from the bill last Saturday on a point of order, sustained by a Chairman from the majority side of this House, who held that there was absolutely no law whatever authorizing the appropriation; that the proposal of the committee to take \$438,000 out of the Treasury was a proposal not authorized by law. It was against the law of the land, and wholly unauthorized. The Republican Chairman of the committee, on a Democratic point of order, held that this \$438,000 was unauthorized, and it went out of the bill. Now the committee, under this steam-roller gag rule, has brought it back and put it into the bill. And this \$438,000 of the people's money will be spent and wasted.

Let me get into the RECORD where it leads us. Under the amendment recently offered by the chairman and adopted by a few Members here—about thirty-odd to 19—it has already provided for secretaries at \$4,000 per annum, assistant secretaries at \$3,625 per annum, second assistant secretaries at \$3,000 per annum, third assistant secretaries at \$2,500 per annum, making a total appropriation of \$418,375; and in addition to all these secretaries, assistant secretaries, and second and third assistant secretaries, amounting to \$418,375, the committee

comes in now and wants to appropriate this sum of \$438,000 for extra clerks for the various embassies in foreign countries. Can you, under such circumstances as this, with this kind of a record facing you, put down in black and white, from which you can not escape—can you go to your constituencies on the hustings in the next few months and tell them that you tried to economize and save money for the Government of the United States? Will they not laugh at you when you make such a claim as that? You will have a devilish hard time in making them believe it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Our constituencies are not from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, so far as the constituencies are concerned, ours in Texas can see right through any camouflage. The people of Texas can look through the camouflage of the facts in any case; and when you employ a big bunch of secretaries at \$4,000, assistant secretaries at \$3,625, second assistant secretaries at \$3,000, and third assistant secretaries at \$2,500, and so on down, making a total of \$418,375, you can not make them believe that it is necessary to appropriate an additional sum of \$438,000 annually for additional clerks.

Now, I am not going to take up any more time, because I can not change the action of the committee, operating under Republican bull-whip, steam-roller rule, but I leave the question right there, having gotten the RECORD straight.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment in the interest of the economy program of the gentleman from Wyoming.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Strike out the figures "\$438,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000."

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming is not here again. I understood him to say in his speech this morning that there were some items in here that he thought ought to be cut down, and I give him notice right here and now that if he does not stay here and help me cut down these items which are absolutely useless, pure extravagances and nothing else, I am going home and let the committee revel in its extravagance. [Laughter.]

I want to say to the gentleman from Wyoming, who is not here and will not stay here when these outrageous items of extravagance are considered, that in 1917 the appropriation for that item amounted to only \$100,000.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that the appropriation for 1918 was \$677,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but that was while we were in the war. We are out of the war, and we ought to get back to the prewar appropriations as nearly as possible. Now, I have offered an amendment which will allow \$300,000 and enable the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to save \$138,000 for "his economy program."

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that the appropriation for the fiscal year ending 1920, passed three months after the signing of the armistice, amounted to \$688,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I tell the gentleman I am aware of that, but that was just after the armistice, when we were winding up affairs and did not know what was going to be done. We know now what is to be done—what has been done. The treaty of peace has been made and the League of Nations established, and why we should appropriate more than we appropriated in 1916 and 1917—during the war—I can not understand. If my amendment is adopted it will still leave an appropriation three times as much as they had in 1917 and enable us to save \$138,000.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that the present Secretary of State recommended that this amount be fixed at \$688,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. And that we cut it to \$438,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and I tell the gentleman that the Secretary of State is a very fine, able, distinguished gentleman, a fine diplomat and all that, and makes a fine Secretary of State—no better; but he has this "tango," "royal" society idea about the clerks and secretaries. He wants to put these American clerks in society, and he asks this thing for that purpose, and no other. In my judgment, it is better to keep our secretaries and clerks out of that kowtowing society and let them sit in their offices

and do business. You know that \$2,000 or \$2,500 or \$3,000 is not going to enable one of our clerks to go into that "hifalutin' society." Why, what would one of the \$2,000 clerks do when the king and queen gave one of their functions—where are they going to be seated at the table?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to know about this now. Take these \$2,500 clerks, that you want to get into society over there. When the king and queen have one of their big international functions what is going to be the precedent of these clerks? Do they come in on an equality with the ambassadors and the ministers; come in arm and arm with them? [Laughter.] Will they take the queen in and sit by her side, or to the right or to the left of the queen or the king? [Laughter.] Will the secretaries come in after the ambassadors and sit by their side? Where do the clerks come—after the secretaries or before the secretaries? When the lords and ladies give these functions, are the clerks going to sit by them? I do not think that you have it large enough, if you want to get them into "society."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that a large number of these clerks are stenographers and typists?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but just think about a stenographer going into "royal society"! Think of the insult that this committee and the Secretary of State and the Congress is going to offer to the queens and kings and the princes and the princesses and the lords and the ladies of Europe by shoving a stenographer into their society! [Laughter.] Why, gentlemen, I just can not stand for it, and why Mr. MONDELL is going to stand for it I do not know. Do you suppose that he is going to stand for this tango foolishness? I do not see, to save my life, when I am giving him an opportunity to have somebody stand with him why he is not here. Mr. BLANTON and myself will certainly stand with him on this matter. [Laughter.] We will stand by him and save \$138,000, and the appropriation will still be three times as large as it was in 1917.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I yield to both the gentlemen.

Mr. TEMPLE. The speech of the gentleman from South Carolina—

Mr. BLANTON. North Carolina.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman from North Carolina. The speech of the gentleman from North Carolina is a very good Primrose and West speech, and it reminds me very much of the famous inquiry of Huckleberry Finn—"How much do a king git?"

Mr. KITCHIN. Let the gentleman just tell me now. Are you really voting for this thing in order to give a stenographer a higher standing in royal society? That is what the Secretary of State is asking. Is that why the gentleman from Pennsylvania votes for this?

Mr. TEMPLE. That is absolutely not what the Secretary of State asks for, and that is not why I am going to vote for it. This is a matter of sober business, not a minstrel end-man affair.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman vote for it on the ground put by the Secretary of State?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not on the ground put by the Secretary of State as stated by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, as stated by him—

As lieutenants of the ambassadors and ministers, the secretaries must be able to mingle with all classes of people and associate upon a plane of equality—

Mr. TEMPLE. Does the gentleman know the difference between a secretary and a clerk?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes—

with the members of the highest social and official circles of the capitals at which they are stationed.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. The Secretary of State put it on the ground that I stated and I want to say—

Mr. TEMPLE. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that what the gentleman read refers to secretaries.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am talking about secretaries' clerks.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman has been talking about clerks.

Mr. KITCHIN. I asked the gentleman if he voted for the increase in the secretaries' salaries a while ago upon the ground stated by the Secretary of State.

Mr. TEMPLE. The point under discussion now is the appropriation for the salaries of clerks to embassies, and not for secretaries.

Mr. KITCHIN. I know, and I am saving you \$138,000. I do not blame the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] for being in favor of these clerks going into this high society, because he has been one of them—I mean that he has gone into this "society" in his visits to London and Paris and other parts of Europe, and he knows what it is—and of course he wants all Americans in office over there, whether they are stenographers or clerks or janitors, to get into it and experience its emotions and sensations.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I want to say that I have a very high regard for the gentleman's opinion at most times, and it seems to me that the Secretary of State's department is a department that should not be disposed of in the spirit of levity.

Mr. KITCHIN. Not a bit. I am trying to show you gentlemen how ridiculous this is.

Mr. BEGG. Is the Secretary's word any good? The Secretary of State said—

Mr. KITCHIN. The committee evidently did not think his word was very good, because in two dozen places they have cut him down in the aggregate \$3,000,000.

Mr. BEGG. The Secretary of State testified before this committee that if he did not get increases for his clerks he would lose the clerks; that they were going into other avenues of business.

Mr. KITCHIN. But my amendment will still give three times as much as they had in 1917.

Mr. BEGG. He testified that even with what we are allowing him it would be questionable whether he would hold these people, but, as far as I am concerned, I will go with the gentleman as far as he wishes in crippling the Secretary of State.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, I do not want to cripple him.

Mr. BEGG. But I do think, in a spirit of fairness to our country and fairness to our Nation's business and reputation and honor, that we either ought to fire the Secretary of State or take his word when he soberly and honestly comes before the committee and gives it.

Mr. KITCHIN. You have repudiated his word to the extent of \$3,700,000.

Mr. BEGG. I beg to differ with the gentleman. The Secretary of State's department admitted they could possibly get along without that.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then, the economy in this bill is because of the Secretary and not because of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to return to page 4, line 22, to insert the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 4, line 22, to page 6, line 24, inclusive, insert the following.

The Clerk proceeded to read the balance of the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Inasmuch as the rule makes any section of the bill in order, I submit to the Chair, on a point of order, that it is improper for the committee, by amendment, to offer more than one section at a time, because the House has a right to vote on these sections separately.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to agree with the gentleman from Texas. The Chair assumes that while one paragraph is considered at a time, it would not be in order to offer an amendment to the whole bill. If the gentleman will offer—

Mr. BLANTON. I want to beg the pardon of the Rules Committee if I am guilty of committing lese majeste in making a point of order now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 22, insert:

"For 10 student interpreters at the legation to China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the legation

and consulates in China, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the legation or consulates in China so long as his services may be required within a period of five years."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. On page 4, line 22, after the word "For," strike out "ten" and insert "six."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON to the amendment offered by the committee: Page 4, line 22, after the word "For," strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my colleagues—the few who happen to be present in the House at this time—to the fact that a little later on we are going to provide, according to the Republican program, for 6 student interpreters to Japan. Why should we have 10 student interpreters to China, drawing \$1,500 a year, for whom we pay \$200 apiece tuition, and for whom we pay \$600 for quarters, and have only 6 to Japan? If 6 student interpreters to Japan are sufficient, why should not 6 student interpreters to China be sufficient? I merely call it to the attention of my colleagues, who are sensible men and business men—at least some of them are; most of them are, I presume; all of them should be business men—why we should put in 10 for China and 6 only for Japan. If it is necessary for us to have American student interpreters going to school in China, drawing a salary of \$1,500, drawing \$200 apiece for tuition, and \$600 for quarters, why should we not have 10 for Japan? If the committee has been consistent in providing only 6 for Japan, then I am sure my amendment is good, seeking to reduce the number to China from 10 to 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 8, insert:

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters in China, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 10, insert:

"For six student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Japanese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Japan, at \$1,500 each, \$9,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the embassy or consulates in Japan so long as his services may be required within a period of five years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 36, noes 1.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 21, insert:

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$1,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 24, insert:

"For 10 student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the language of Turkey and any other language that may be necessary to qualify them for service as interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Turkey, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method

of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter to the embassy and consulates in Turkey so long as his services may be required within a period of five years."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] is recognized.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how many of these students they have in Turkey now actually studying?

Mr. PORTER. What was the question?

Mr. LITTLE. How many of these 10 student interpreters have they actually?

Mr. PORTER. I think they have the full number, although I am not sure.

Mr. LITTLE. How many consulates have they in Turkey?

Mr. PORTER. I do not have the number handy, but I will give it to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, Turkey is a defunct empire. If there was a time when there was reason for having 10 students to learn its language and customs and familiarize themselves with its business, it has gone by. Turkey is divided into other countries de facto and soon will be de jure. There is no reason why we should involve ourselves in these useless expenses. The country should save this money, for the simple reason that Turkey is no longer Turkey, and there is no longer any demand like there was for these students. There never was any, anyway. There never was at any time any necessity for it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Not just now. I will yield in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LITTLE. At the very least, you ought to cut this down. I am going to ask the chairman if he would not agree to a motion to reduce this from 10 to 4?

Mr. PORTER. I would not care to do so except upon the recommendation of the Department of State. It is only a question of time when we will resume our relations with Turkey. These students in Turkey are absolutely necessary to the service.

Mr. LITTLE. Let me say right here that they are not. There is no business in Turkey to justify any such selection, and if the department is coming to the committee and telling us that we are going to resume relations with Turkey in the very near future there is hardly anybody here who would believe it. There is not any more Turkey, but we will resume relations with some part of Turkey at some time. The 10 student interpreters in China are very useful, but these in Turkey are of no value. Let us save a little money here. What is the use in making this appropriation? We are allowing the Department of State, which, it has developed, does not know much about it, to mislead us here.

The other day I made some suggestions as to certain idiosyncrasies which had been recommended by the department which were found to be mistakes, and it turned out that the thing was in worse shape than I thought, because when the discussion was over and the storm wound up it was ascertained that you did not have enough law to found practically any appropriation upon it at all, and you had to go and frame a rule and have it brought in here to support it. This committee is not to blame for that, however. The other side has done it for years, brought in such a bill, and it is not unnatural that both committees should follow the lead of the State Department. The committees are not to blame; but you are to be blamed if, having these mistakes pointed out to you, you still continue them. There is no one in the State Department who is competent to inform you about this. It is a fact that the reports of the State Department are often incorrect and inaccurate, so that you can not found items in a bill upon such reports. You should get what data you can together, and then do the best you can. Here is an admirable instance where a saving can be made. Here is a country that has gone out of business, where we formerly had 10 students, and we have the same number in China, a country of 400,000,000 people, almost, with 10 student interpreters. Can you not see at a glance that there is a mistake here?

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the gentleman from Kansas understand that these student interpreters are being educated in order to be of assistance to certain financial interests in this country in establishing industries in Turkey to compete with American factories?

Mr. LITTLE. I did not so understand it.

Mr. KING. We might as well understand what the purpose of this bill is.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "ten" and insert "four," on page 5, line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE to the amendment offered by the committee: Page 5, line 24, after the word "For," strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has already taken his time on the amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. I can wait for another amendment, then.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we had better proceed with the consideration of the bill, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. LITTLE. That is what I am here for, to proceed with the consideration of the bill. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that I am entitled to be heard on my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the gentleman would have the right, under the rules of the House, to make a speech in advance, and then to make another speech after offering the motion. It could only be done under unanimous consent.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to be heard in advance.

The CHAIRMAN. It can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, well, I will get time later on.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I move to strike out "ten" and insert "six," to provide for 6 student interpreters instead of 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] has moved to strike out "ten" and insert "four."

Mr. BLANTON. I move to strike out "ten" and insert "six."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out "ten" and insert "six."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a while ago the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], who has had wide experience in consular work and is the only man in the House who has had such personal experience, asked the chairman of this committee how many of these students we now have in Turkey. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee could not tell him. He did not know anything about it. He brings in a measure before the House to have a provision made law when he does not even know and he can not answer a pertinent question. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] asked another question. He asked the chairman of this committee whether or not it was going to be necessary to keep these students there, and how many interpreters we had at this time in Turkey.

The chairman said he could not tell it. He did not know. Now, the committee has brought in a bill here providing only 6 student interpreters to Japan, a great big country like Japan, a country whose language is hard to learn, and yet they have provided for a country like Turkey 10 student interpreters when we have only allowed 6 for Japan. Ah, the gentleman from Kansas touched the keynote Saturday when in discussing this matter he said the item in this bill was pure graft, and in a large measure it is. It is for the purpose of putting a bunch of pet favorites over there who want to take a trip to Japan, a trip to Turkey, or a trip to China, go to school, get \$1,500 a year, get \$200 for tuition and \$600 for quarters, and after getting the education come back here and sell it to the merchants of this country.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware that these students have to sign an agreement to remain in the service for five years?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but what does that amount to, and what is the agreement worth? I have seen lady school-teachers in my State sign an agreement when entering a State normal school to learn how to teach, that after graduation they would teach so many years in the State, and then when they came out they would marry as soon as they graduated and not a day did they teach. How are you going to reach them? They merely say they will do it, but they do not do it. What comes after that? Nothing. The gentleman from Kansas was right when he said it was monkey business, but we can not expect anything else with the Republican steam-roller

power that is in the saddle ready to bleed the Treasury to death.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I make the point of order that that is an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. SMALL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this discussion about economy in this appropriation bill, making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service, induces me to make an observation. I notice the bill takes up the various activities of the Department of State, which has to do with the foreign relations of the Government of the United States. It takes up separately each activity and makes an appropriation therefor. I understood the distinguished chairman of the committee to say that the committee in formulating the bill heard evidence from the Secretary of State and other sources, and then exercised such judgment as the committee was permitted to exercise in agreeing upon the items of the appropriation for these different activities.

I have observed also that in the discussion so far it has been taken up by paragraphs, each appropriation discussed, and amendments offered or otherwise. I am curious to know why that course was pursued with reference to this appropriation bill for the Diplomatic and Consular Service and not pursued with reference to the river and harbor bill. Why, if the steering committee desired to economize, did they not pursue the same policy in this bill that they did with the river and harbor bill? Why did not they adopt the same plan that they did with the river and harbor bill?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will not make any progress by that method.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. All I want is to save time.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will not save time in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. SMALL. I am discussing this bill, Mr. Chairman. The committee has brought in items aggregating upwards of \$8,000,000. I assume that that was the aggregate of these several appropriations for the various activities of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. Why did not the steering committee say that \$8,000,000 is too much and direct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make it, say, \$6,000,000? They could have saved \$2,000,000 in that way.

Why not make it \$4,000,000? Would the steering committee reply that \$4,000,000, when divided up among the activities of the Diplomatic and Consular Service, would not meet the needs of the service or that it could not be intelligently and wisely allocated? I might answer that the suggestion of \$12,000,000 for the river and harbor bill was made without rhyme or reason; it had no application to any of the estimates considered by the committee. It had no reference to the various activities for the improvement and maintenance of the rivers and harbors of the country as set forth in the annual report of the Chief of Engineers. Why did not you make this appropriation \$6,000,000, and save over \$2,000,000, just like you saved it in the river and harbor bill?

Now, gentlemen, I am going to continue to ask this question about the various appropriation bills until Members of the House shall understand the flagrant injustice that has been done to that great activity of the Government, the maintenance and improvement of our rivers and harbors, so closely associated with the prosperity of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more. I want to keep him straight.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks that the time of his colleague be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. As I understand, the steering committee intended to make this a lump sum and let the Secretary of State spend it as he saw fit.

Mr. SMALL. In this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I understand that was the program.

Mr. SMALL. I am shocked.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman need not be shocked; that might be the wise thing to do. But they found that the Secretary of State was liable to spend all of it on these secretaries, janitors, and stenographers in getting them into real society.

Mr. SMALL. Could not the Secretary of State allot the appropriations under existing law as wisely as the Chief of Engineers could allot it under the river and harbor bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. The committee did not object so much to that, but they did not want the Secretary of State to pay it all to the secretaries and stenographers and janitors in order to get them into society. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMALL. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. [Laughter.]

I have received a copy of resolutions adopted by the Commercial Club of Madison, Ind., on January 23, 1920, which, by leave of the House, I append to my remarks:

Whereas the action of the House of Representatives this week in curtailing 70 per cent the usual annual appropriations for river and harbor improvements must inevitably delay the completion of projects important in our national transportation system: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Commercial Club of Madison, Ind., That we view with profound regret what we must consider a backward and most unfortunate step;

That we cite the many years which have elapsed since the construction of the Davis Island Dam, the first upon the Ohio River, an average man's lifetime, and the system still so incomplete as to be comparatively useless.

We cite the fact that 10 years ago, in 1910, Congress passed a resolution affirming its purpose to complete the Ohio River project by 1920. Under the present policy and appropriations it will require at least six more years, and 1920 is here.

We regard as deceptive and illusory the plausible proposition that the unexpended balances in the Treasury are sufficient for all Ohio River work possible this fiscal year.

We contend the customary appropriation of \$5,000,000 for new work upon the Ohio River should have been made in order that advantage might be taken of low water, if we have it, or other favorable conditions; that the construction of many locks and dams might be carried on simultaneously; and we urge that this annual appropriation for new locks and dams upon the Ohio River be yet made and be subject to the call of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

We protest against the new theory advanced by the honorable chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee that appropriations should only be made to take care of existing commerce. We assert a vast commerce has been driven from the Ohio River by lack of a channel of sufficient depth and the piratical rate cutting and other hostile and illegal practices of railroad corporations; that this commerce will be immediately restored by the completion of the system of locks and dams and the enactment of proper protective legislation; that to propose to wait until the commerce restores itself unaided is fallacious and bears the appearance of being suggested in bad faith or by want of thought.

We, therefore, as representatives of the commercial and manufacturing interests of the city of Madison, and the agricultural interests of this section of the Ohio Valley, respectfully petition and urge upon the House of Representatives the reconsideration of their action in respect to the river and harbor appropriation bill, H. R. 11892, and do hereby earnestly request that it be amended and passed in the form recommended by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the benefit and advantage of the entire country.

Resolved, That we especially call upon our representative in Congress, Hon. JOHN S. BENHAM, to actively and vigorously sustain the views we have presented, and also urge the same effectiveness upon the part of our United States Senators from Indiana, Hon. HARRY S. NEW and Hon. JAMES E. WATSON.

Resolved, That our secretary is hereby instructed to send copies of these resolutions to Hon. CHARLES A. KENNEDY, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, House of Representatives; Hon. JOHN S. BENHAM, Member of Congress; and Senators HARRY S. NEW and JAMES E. WATSON.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last half of the section. On Saturday I made a motion to change Luxemburg over to Belgium, where it ought to be and was promptly met with a point of order that it was not within the law. It gradually developed that most of the rest of the bill was in the same situation, so that no time was made in that way. Just now I have made a motion to reduce 10 interpreter students to 6, and because the State Department so recommended and without any knowledge of the facts the committee insists upon putting in 10. I have just heard an inquiry from one of the committee in respect to the language spoken over there. In the first place, most of the people in the old Turkish Empire speak Arabic. All of the people who live in Egypt and about Damascus and Jerusalem, and in Mesopotamia, and that country over there, speak Arabic. In Kurdistan, they speak Kurdish. In Armenia, they speak Armenian. The only place where many of the people of the old empire speak Turkish is in Anatolia, a northwestern Province of Asia Minor, and in Turkey

in Europe. A very small percentage of this territory was occupied by people who spoke Turkish. Practically all of the trade was done with people who speak Arabic.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. In a moment. If you will turn to the bill itself, you will see that it says to teach the people to speak Turkish and the other language in the Empire. That is because the man who originally drew that item knew that Turkish was a very minor language in that country. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. I was merely going to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that these student interpreters are to speak not only Turkish but any other language that may be necessary to qualify them for service at the embassies and consulates in Turkey.

Mr. LITTLE. But I beat you to it. Just now I gave that information.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman is assuming that the committee did not know when that language was incorporated in the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Evidently some of the committee did not know it, because one of them was trying to tell us why they should be taught Turkish. A very small part of those interpreters would be taught Turkish, as I have suggested to the gentleman. Arabic would be the most useful language. They do not teach Arabic in Constantinople, but it is taught at Cairo and at the American colleges at Beirut and Assiut. Those people should be educated at Assiut and Beirut. There is no excuse in the world for educating 10 interpreters at Constantinople. There is no business through the country that warrants it or makes it necessary. At Roberts College are hundreds of young men, Turks, learning English.

There are scores on scores of American missionaries and students in American colleges there who speak English and Arabic and Turkish. There is, as I said, a college at Constantinople where they teach young Turks English. There are no such high-class institutions in Japan and China, maintained for the purpose of doing that. You do not any more need 10 student interpreters or 1 in Turkey than you need an extra thumb on one of your hands. The committee has just done what the State Department has told them, and has slapped it in. I want to support the committee. They have evidently saved a great deal of money. You can tell that is so by the fuss that is made by the Democrats on the other side of the aisle. You men have been doing very good work from the way they act. A man never groans unless he is hurt, and they would not be howling around here about saving money if you had not done so. But that has nothing to do with the hiring of 10 interpreters for Turkey. Roberts College and the college at Beirut and at Assiut teach men both Arabic and Turkish. There are thousands of young men who are seeking to go to these colleges to learn English, and the committee should not permit the department to waste this \$15,000 when so many young men are studying these languages there in the mission schools. Let us be reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have not any special knowledge to warrant me in giving an opinion on the proposition which has been discussed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE]. I know that he has special knowledge of that proposition. However, Mr. Chairman, I want to give expression before this committee rises to my great satisfaction on the bill which has been presented by the committee. I think they have had in mind the main idea. It consists of two propositions. In the first place, a condition that requires the strengthening of our Diplomatic Service, and a condition that requires that more than ever before, in order that we may be intelligently and adequately represented in the countries to which we will be required to send our representatives, we must enlarge and strengthen the present service. There never was a time in the history of the country when we needed to strengthen our Diplomatic and Consular Service more than at the present. It seems to me that there can not be a man on the floor of this House but must recognize that fact. I think the committee has done well under the circumstances, and within the limits existing, to see to it that the present shall not be a period of retrogression, and that we should generally strengthen the service for the time when we will have to very materially enlarge it. Within a very short time, in order to decently, not to say adequately, represent this country, we will be compelled to enlarge our Diplomatic and Consular Service. I am very glad, indeed, that the committee has done what it could under the conditions that exist with regard to our financial situation and the condition of the Treasury in presenting a bill here which, in my

judgment, ought to receive the support of every member of the committee and of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 11, insert:

"For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, after line 19, insert:

"For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Japan, \$600."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 22, insert:

"For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Turkey, \$600."

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman animadverted to the necessity of interpreters for the future, which I recognize as much as anybody. I want to call attention to an incident which may illustrate to you the absolute fallacy of the idea of expending taxpayers' money to learn Arabic and Turkish. We have a school at Assiut to teach young men the Arabic and the English languages. At Beirut we have a similar school. In the two there have been thousands of young men. They go to those schools and they learn the English language, and there are hundreds of people in that Empire who speak the English language just as well as you and I do. This section is for the purpose of educating somebody and giving him a lift. The opportunity is admirably given at Assiut, Beirut, and elsewhere.

The thing I had in mind, which may illustrate to you the absurdity of it, is a little incident that occurred to me in Montreal a few years ago when I was going down to the depot. I saw a young man who had a book in his hand, with a paper cover on it, that was printed in Arabic. It made me think of the old times. Of course, I know not so many words of Arabic, but I slipped my arm about him as I went along and I said, "Nahar ac zied, effendi." He was pleased to hear somebody speak his mother tongue. I do not know enough Arabic to talk very long, and I exhausted all the little that I had, and then I went to talking the English language, when I found that he had been at Beirut and spoke as good English as I did. And I found that the book he was reading was one of Shakespeare's plays that had been translated into Arabic.

I feel that we are being worked by somebody down in the department who does not know anything about it. This House ought to have more respect for itself. You do not say a word when your President talks about Poland and Czechoslovakia and recognizes them. Why do not you say something about these things? Where is the law that says you can not send a minister to Armenia or to Georgia, when he is sending commissioners to Budapest and Riga? I think the commissioner there gets 75 per cent of a minister's pay. The President does not ask you to do it; he goes ahead and does it. Why do you not take upon yourselves a little responsibility and do what is right about such a little thing as this?

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman thinks that we should have embassies and legations in these nations, why does he not introduce a bill to that effect?

Mr. LITTLE. If I thought I would get any more consideration for it than I got for the resolution, or amendment, which I introduced here yesterday, I would do it.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman introduce a bill?

Mr. LITTLE. I will if you advise it.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman seems to be convinced of the wisdom of doing it.

Mr. LITTLE. As I said, if I do not get any higher welcome than I have so far with my suggestions, it would not be a wise thing to do it. But if the gentleman advises me to do it, I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas has spoken of the institutions to be found within the Turkish

Empire and in Egypt, a former dependency of the Turkish Empire. The committee knows, of course, of the institutions mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas. I am personally acquainted with a good many of the professors in the college at Assiut. In spite of the gentleman's acquaintance with conditions in the Turkish Empire he entirely misunderstands the purpose of this paragraph of the bill. He speaks of institutions where natives can learn to speak the English language. It is the purpose of this appropriation to make provision for the reverse of that. It is the purpose to teach the various languages used in Turkey to Americans who are to be employed in the embassies.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman knows that it is one of the requirements of those schools that they shall know Arabic before they begin teaching. You have a splendid array of missionaries in Turkey—

Mr. TEMPLE. You could never get one of them to leave the missionary work and accept the salary of interpreter.

Mr. LITTLE. I had one at Alexandria while I was there.

Mr. TEMPLE. But he continued his missionary work at the same time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield? In what language are the publications of the Turkish Empire printed?

Mr. TEMPLE. They are printed in more than one.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Are they printed in Turkish?

Mr. TEMPLE. In Turkish and other languages.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the provision which says:

For 10 student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States.

They are not Arabs and Turks who may be taught English but Americans who are to be employed in the embassies and consulates, and who must be American citizens, loyal to this country, worthy of being trusted with confidential business, and must be made familiar with the languages that are spoken in Turkey, including the Turkish, Arabic, and others.

Mr. LITTLE. Can the gentleman tell me how many Americans there are acting as students?

Mr. TEMPLE. I looked in the directory a moment ago and found, in spite of the disorganization of the service which necessarily followed the breaking off relations, there are still persons who are drawing salaries as provided in this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit, I would like to say that if the gentleman from Kansas in all of the years he spent in Turkey, and with his distinguished ability, was unable to learn the Turkish language, does it not only emphasize the necessity for providing some method for teaching American citizens the Turkish language in order that they may perform the necessary service?

Mr. TEMPLE. It seems to me it is necessary, if the diplomatic and consular work is to be carried on by Americans who are loyal to this country, to teach our own people these languages, and to begin when they are young enough to learn them.

Mr. LITTLE. That emphasizes the point I am making. There was not anyone in Egypt talking Turkish.

Mr. TEMPLE. But they teach some of the other languages used in that country and referred to in line 2, page 6.

Mr. LITTLE. They teach Arabic out there. The point is made clear by the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] did not say how many of those students there are on the record.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman knows very well that we have broken off diplomatic relations with Turkey, and that all of the diplomatic and consular officers were removed, and we are now looking after American interests under an informal arrangement by means of an American commission as distinguished from an embassy or legation, and are making only partial progress. I call the gentleman's attention to testimony which appears in the committee hearings, as follows:

The situation all over Europe is anomalous; and the action is not to be determined by any prewar principle of international law. In Turkey we have a high commissioner who is an admiral; we have a commissioner who was formerly American consul general, and we have several consular officers who do not function as consular officers, but are unofficial assistants to the high commissioner and the commissioner. It is very necessary that those officials be there as observers and workers in cooperation with the representatives of the allied Governments at those places, for the protection of legitimate American interests.

Outside of the State Department nobody knows, I presume, whether additional adjustments have been made within the last week or in the last 24 hours.

Mr. LITTLE. How many do you find in the record?

Mr. TEMPLE. The record is available to the gentleman. Now, these interpreters, American citizens, who learn the languages of the various parts of the Turkish Empire—

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will pardon me, I did not catch the question that the gentleman from Kansas asked and what the gentleman's answer was.

Mr. TEMPLE. His question was how many student interpreters there are now. I say our whole Diplomatic and Consular Service has been withdrawn from Turkey and has not been restored. It is impossible to tell how much progress has been made from day to day in the reestablishment of this work through the American mission in the Turkish Empire.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. There are no student interpreters needed in Turkey at the present time?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. There is one in Egypt and there are two in Japan and there are five in China and one in Siam.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Have we not passed upon the question as to whether or not we are to have these 10 interpreters?

Mr. TEMPLE. There is an amendment still pending. That is what is under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, did I not have an amendment pending before that was to be voted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. No. It was a motion in opposition to the amendment. The Chair will state that when the committee adjourned on Saturday the committee was dividing on the paragraph on line 24 of page 6. The question is on agreeing to that item.

The item was agreed to.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, repairs, postage, telegrams, furniture, typewriters, including exchange of same, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreters, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss of bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, including such loss on bills of exchange to officers of the United States courts for China, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$810,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the total sum appropriated by this paragraph, \$810,000, for the expenses of embassies, seems like a very large sum, but I have no doubt the committee went over it carefully, as they have done with respect to all the items in this bill, the framing of which I very much commend, and it is probably justified.

I listened with much interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], made when the rule was offered to-day, and with most of what he said I entirely agree. He seemed, however, to be somewhat concerned with reference to a matter that never has caused me any worry of late years. If I understood correctly the subject to which he was referring, I take it that he had in mind the salaries which are paid to our ambassadors and ministers. Complaint has been constantly made that they were not sufficient, and that by reason of that fact they had to be filled, as is sometimes stated—and I think the gentleman from Ohio himself so said—from the ranks of the idle rich.

Now, there was a time when it was highly important as to who should fill these ambassadorial posts. Years ago, before the Atlantic cables were established, communication took sometimes a month, and in the early days of the Republic sometimes two months. The ambassador had to conduct the international

affairs of our country entirely without any advice from Washington. At the present day, however, the cable is at his instant command, and he gets his directions every day, and sometimes every hour, from here. The principal thing that he does is to make speeches which are noncommittal in nature. He ought to be a very affable man, a very attractive man in personality, one who will get along with everybody, give no offense, and do but little that will commit his Government to anything whatever, except as he is instructed from Washington. For that reason I see no reason why these posts should not be filled by wealthy men. It is altogether different from the situation that would be presented if we undertook to fill the ranks of this Assembly or of the Senate solely with wealthy men, in which event the greater portion of our citizens would not be represented at all.

Mr. BAER. Does not the gentleman think that would be dangerous, in view of the advantages that these men would have in trade relations, which is very important? These men might be connected with large corporations, which would make it inexpedient for us to confine it simply to wealthy men. If you confine these appointments, with all the information that they obtain with regard to foreign trade, to men of wealth, it would be dangerous. I think we ought to pay our ambassadors enough to secure the services of efficient men. I think we should pay them even double, if necessary, so that they would have plenty on which to live in decency and would be respected by the people of foreign nations. I do not think this is the place to economize.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The consuls have more to do with trade relations than the ambassadors themselves. The positions of consuls ought not to be filled solely with the ranks of wealthy men. But the principal qualification of an ambassador is to appear well in high society, to handle himself in a creditable manner in the midst of the society in which he is presented. He should be, as I said, agreeable and affable to all, and very often a poor man might not be so well qualified in that respect. Moreover, he often is compelled to entertain in a very expensive manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A poor man, I say, might not be so well qualified to shine in that class of society as one who has spent all his life in their midst. Our ambassadors have distinguished themselves of late years, not so much by what they have done as by what they have not done. They have not got our Nation into any trouble. They have always expressed themselves in an agreeable way toward the nations to which they were accredited. They often distinguish themselves as after-dinner speakers. They promote friendly social relations and create mutual good feeling, and use their money in lavish entertainment. That is what they are principally for, at the present time. They control nothing of the important matters, and for that reason I think we might well use their wealth in this manner.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Do these foreign ambassadors have anything to do with the determining of the policy of this Government in foreign countries, such as the policy in Mexico?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They do not and ought not to, in my opinion.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Is there anything in the bill that compels a man to be rich or poor in order to be an ambassador?

Mr. ROGERS. It is what is not in the bill that has that effect.

Mr. BAER. If the ambassador does not get enough salary, unless he is rich, he can not live over there.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is said that our ambassadors can not live in proper style on the sums that are appropriated for that purpose. Probably they can not if they make the display, and go through the pomp and ceremony that for ages has attached to their position. Many of us, like myself, consider all this as a legacy of folly inherited from the days when kings were considered divine and their representatives were expected by their gilded trappings and retinues of servants to exemplify the greatness and wealth of their sovereign lords. If some wealthy man wants to spend his money in this idle show, which, to my mind, is as senseless as a peacock's strut with his tail feathers extended, let him do it; but I am opposed to using the people's money for that purpose.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend this paragraph by inserting a comma after the word "expenses," in line 2, which the context clearly requires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to insert a comma after the word "expenses," in line 2. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DOWELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 11606) for a bridge over the Wabash River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3451. An act authorizing and directing the United States Shipping Board to adjust and pay the claims of wooden-ship builders arising out of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], in a much milder and more genteel fashion than that employed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] on last Saturday, seems to have sought to minimize the dignity and functions of our foreign ambassadors and ministers. Gentlemen who were in the Chamber on last Saturday will recall that the gentleman from Massachusetts, while the question of the appropriation for ambassadors to Russia, Turkey, and Austria-Hungary was under discussion, sought to characterize these gentlemen, not by name but by a sweeping charge, as mere figureheads, and later on in his discussion he referred to some of the United States ministers serving in recent years at least as having been "scum of the earth." Now, I take it that since we were then discussing the ambassadors at Petrograd, Turkey, and Austria-Hungary, the gentleman in employing the language "figureheads" must have referred to some of the gentlemen representing this country at those courts in the recent past.

I repudiate and denounce the proposition that an ambassador representing this country in a foreign capital should not possess large ability, and I also deny that those who have represented this country within the last few years have been lacking in those qualities. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] in using the word "figurehead" could have referred to Mr. Francis, of Missouri, who rose from a newsboy on the streets of St. Louis to be the governor of a great State, and who so acceptably and capably performed the duties of ambassador to Russia? I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts could have referred to Mr. Morgenthau, the distinguished gentleman who, though I understand he was born in a foreign land, rendered such patriotic service during the war? I wonder if he could have referred to Mr. Penfield, who served at Vienna? I wonder, if he had no reference to those gentlemen, if he included within his description Mr. Sharp, a former Member of this House, who at Paris during the troublous times of the war represented the interests of this Government so efficiently and so admirably as to meet the approval of the whole Nation? Or, if he did not refer to any of these gentlemen, perhaps he had in his mind that other representative of this Government, Mr. Brand Whitlock, who at Brussels during the time of the German invasion succored the needy and interceded for the helpless and held the one lone outpost of justice and of right amidst that savage storm?

I repudiate the doctrine as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] that because of the cable it is not necessary for our representatives to be men of large ability and wide vision. It is very easy for one who has not the proper qualifications to involve this country in troubles with foreign powers. It is very easy to do that which he should not do or to fail to do that which he should do and thereby bring about a very critical state of affairs. Of course he should be in communication with Washington by cable, because all our ambassadors are representatives of the President of the United States, who under the Constitution is given the power to carry on the foreign affairs of this Government, and who is responsible for their discharge; but that fact does not necessarily imply that his agents or servants should not be men of large ability and wide experience, and I utterly denounce such a proposition.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment, to reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The CHAIRMAN. Can not the gentleman address his remarks to the next paragraph?

Mr. LITTLE. I want to speak right now in answer to the gentleman from Texas.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] wisely suggested that the American ambassadors ought to be men of ability. That is true. It is singularly unfortunate that more talent is not called into that service. The reason is this: It has been heralded abroad for a long time that nobody except a rich man can afford to take one of these positions. That is done with the direct purpose of preventing men of ability from going after them. Both parties select for these positions men who have contributed to their campaign funds and who, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] suggested, have pleasing address and can get along without breaking the window panes, and who are sent over there in the hope that they will get through without getting us into trouble. For that reason there is no demand for these positions by men of real ability who have not independent means.

In the old days an ambassador was the personal representative of his king, and when he went to another capital he represented his king and was entitled to the same courtesy and attention and ceremonies that his king would be because he was the king's personal representative. So, it was a great thing to be an ambassador. All that remains of that now is the old custom of being ceremonious. It is the one place on earth where fine clothes are the principal distinguishing characteristic of the function. As has been suggested here, the business is largely done from the capitals of the respective countries, and not through the ambassador. The wiser and better he is, the better it is for his country, but if we could get rid of the idea that nobody except a rich man can go, we would have some ability in these positions, and we would not be told that they were such figureheads. There is not much to it. Of course, the consular office is the place where the principal business is done. Practically all of any importance is done through the consul, and the committee can not go too far in backing up the Consular Service, and in sending American citizens with strong arms and strong minds to extend our business relations abroad, and they can not go too far. I wish we could get away from the ideas of these ceremonies and fancy clothes, and these idle men. I said to an ambassador once, "What do you do at home?" He said, "I try as hard as I can to do nothing." He had so much money that he did not have to work, and he did not want to work. The idea apparently is to select an ambassador who has got so much money that he does not have to work at home, and send him abroad. That ought to be stopped.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman understands that when we send an ambassador to a foreign country he must follow their customs. Is not that true?

Mr. LITTLE. No. Why should he?

Mr. LAZARO. He must attend the functions to which he is invited. He must become friendly.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes. He has got to have a set of evening clothes and a white shirt.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman must know that it costs money to do that.

Mr. LITTLE. Benjamin Franklin did not have money, and I have never heard that he made a failure. Who are the representatives of France, England, and Italy here? What difference does it make whether they go to parties or not? How does that assist them in doing the business of their countries? An ambassador is sent to attend to certain duties, and it does not make any difference whether he has a dress suit or not. That does not assist him to carry out the business of his Government. If it does we have a mighty cheap set of skates down there, and the same everywhere else. It is not the man who is successful in society that makes the best ambassador; it is the man of ability and good sense, whether he goes to a party or not.

Mr. LAZARO. I do not mean that it is the man who does society the best, but at the same time if an ambassador is invited to functions he must be courteous and accept.

Mr. LITTLE. A college professor as poor as skim milk may be courteous and a man of good sense. There are several Members of Congress who have not enough money to sustain them through life, but who would make good ministers. Wealth is not necessary to an ambassadorship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

STEAM LAUNCH FOR EMBASSY AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

Hiring of steam launch for use of embassy at Constantinople, \$1,800.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question for information. I move to strike out the last word. Here is \$1,800 for a steam launch over in Constantinople. Why do you want to have a launch when you have nobody to ride in it?

Mr. PORTER. The money will not be used unless there is somebody there to use it. It might be more correct to say that

the American Government has a representative in Constantinople who may have use for the launch.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would like to say, while I have the five minutes, that I overlooked these items on page 7, and thought that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was going to take care of that proposition, and he would cut down the estimates about \$200,000, and possibly have offered an amendment himself, but he has left me, and I have no encouragement, and stand no show in getting a reduction of the bill unless the chairman of the steering committee helps me. Therefore I did not call the attention of the House to that item, which is about twice as large as it was in 1917. Possibly we could have saved \$200,000 to the program of the gentleman from Wyoming. But I want to say that I am gratified that my friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], a member of the committee, informs the House that this economy was not effected by the steering committee or by Mr. MONDELL or by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but it really was effected by the Secretary of State. He says that the Secretary of State told him that they could cut it out.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not recall in any period of the last two Congresses that the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the steering committee, endeavored to cut down the appropriations.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, we never had any steering committee. We believed in and had confidence in the committees and their qualifications, and that they would do the right and proper thing. We did not have any steering committee where one man is worth 25 votes. The gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Moore, and now Mr. DARROW, is considered by your plan of organization to be worth 25 times as much, with 25 times more sense and 25 times more judgment, with 25 times more influence, than your distinguished leader Mr. MONDELL. We did not have committees appointed in that way.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is talking at cross purposes. I was not speaking of the committee on committees.

Mr. KITCHIN. We did not have one.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I was talking of the steering committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. We did not have a steering committee.

Mr. BAER. The gentleman from North Carolina is talking about the committee on committees.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from North Carolina always refuses to discuss that.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from North Dakota does not understand his own organization and none of the other Republicans understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I hope the gentleman from North Carolina can have his time extended so as to answer my question. I think it is important that the gentleman explain the work of his steering committee. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BLANTON. The regular order is, Is there objection? If the leader on this side of the House can not have five minutes I object and I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the Republicans do not want me to tell them about their own organization—

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to have the gentleman tell us about his steering committee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was being taken, when Mr. ROGERS asked for tellers.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is out of order when the Chair has found that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ROGERS. The Chair has not announced that there was no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. No; but he knows that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on ordering tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ROGERS and Mr. BLANTON.

The committee divided.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from North Carolina can have five minutes, I will withdraw the point of no quorum before the announcement is made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his point of no quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not withdraw the point of no quorum.

The tellers reported that there were 2 ayes and 55 noes.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers report on this vote that the ayes are 2 and the noes are 55, so the committee refuses to rise. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Texas has made a point of order that there is no quorum present. That is pending. Pending the point of order that there is no quorum present the motion was made that the committee rise. That has been voted down. The point of order that no quorum is present is still pending unless the gentleman withdraws it.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized, I will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Texas to withdraw his point of order, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members present, a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Chair on his arithmetic, although I counted more than the Chairman did. I really do not want to appear discourteous to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. I really had nothing to say, but he asked me a question, and I was cut off, so that it made it appear that I was very discourteous.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman will pardon me, but he took five minutes a few moments ago in evading an answer to my question. Now, will he take these five minutes in answering it? I am referring to the steering committee, and the gentleman was speaking about the committee on committees.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, since I have been in Congress the Democrats have never had a steering committee, for the reason that the chairman of the various legislative committees were selected only with reference to their superior qualifications for the position. We had no such method as now prevails in the Republican organization at all. We appointed all committees with reference to the qualification of the men appointed upon them, and it was never necessary for them to have an overlord or boss. We never jacked them up and said, "Here is what we want you to do or not to do." They reported out the various bills, and they were accepted as such because we had confidence in their judgment, wisdom, and patriotism. While I was the majority leader I never had to call anyone down, because they always did the proper thing; and to show you that they did the proper thing, my friend LONGWORTH voted for everything that was reported out, except one bill—yes; he voted for the revenue bill—in 1916; so you see our committees had sense enough to legislate and recommend legislation themselves. It was legislation that appealed not only to our approval and judgment but to that of Mr. LONGWORTH and the judgment of many others on the Republican side.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is speaking of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The discussion that is now proceeding has nothing to do with the measure under consideration and the motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to get to the point of how this bill comes in here—

Mr. WALSH. Oh, the gentleman told us about that this morning. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not going to insist on violating the rules. Of course, if the gentleman from Massachusetts does not want all of the Republicans present to know the manner of their organization and what unheard-of methods they have adopted, such as were never before adopted in a legislative body in the world—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then, of course, I shall have to wait. Only about half a dozen of you know how it is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALLOWANCE TO WIDOWS OR HEIRS OF DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS WHO DIE ABROAD.

Payment under the provisions of section 1749 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to the widows or heirs at law of diplomatic or consular officers of the United States dying in foreign countries in the discharge of their duties, \$5,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer to amend by inserting the words "or consular" after the word "diplomatic," in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 13, after the word "diplomatic" insert the words "and consular."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties, including employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary; and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as established under existing treaties, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including the salaries of the commissioner and the necessary engineers, surveyors, draftsmen, computers, and clerks in the field and at the seat of government, rental of offices at Washington, D. C., expense of printing and necessary traveling, for payment for timber necessarily cut in determining the boundary line not to exceed \$500, and commutation to members of the field force while on field duty or actual expenses not exceeding \$5 per day each to be expended in accordance with regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of State, \$55,000, together with the unexpended balances of previous appropriations for these objects: *Provided*, That hereafter advances of money under the appropriation "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, and the United States and Canada," may be made to the commissioner on the part of the United States and by his authority to chiefs of parties, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct, and accounts arising under advances shall be rendered through and by the commissioner on the part of the United States to the Treasury Department as under advances heretofore made to chiefs of parties: *Provided*, That when the commissioner is absent from Washington on official business he shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence, not in excess of \$8 per day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, on page 12, line 8, after the word "Washington," I move to insert the words "and from his regular place of residence."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 8, after the word "Washington" insert the words "and from his regular place of residence."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I do not aim this amendment at this particular individual, but I expect to offer a similar amendment at other places in the bill in respect to other commissions of this kind. My understanding is—and I do not know that this has been true recently, but my attention has been called to at least one case in which a commissioner of this kind had spent a good deal of time at his regular residence away from Washington, and while at home was claiming to have been performing part of his duties, and since he was away from Washington had been collecting his \$8 per day expense account. I do not make the charge against the man performing this particular service, but it does seem to me it is a very fair provision to insert in respect to all of these commissions that if the commissioner is at home where his regular residence is, he shall not be allowed to collect \$8 a day expenses because he happens to be away from Washington and may be performing some of his duties, such as the preparing of reports and things of that kind. If he chooses to go to his regular residence it does not seem to me that he ought to be allowed to collect per diem expenses. I take it that as far as the point of order is concerned it is a limitation on the appropriation and under the Holman rule it would be in order.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, right there I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the committee can not accept an amendment with a point of order reserved against it.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to ask the chairman a question while he is on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that we dispose now first of the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. It is legislation and it does not reduce expenses. It rather increases them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is right along with that particular proviso. It is no more legislation than the proviso itself. It seems to me that it would be in order. On the other hand, it does not seem to me to be anything more than a qualification and limitation on the language of the second proviso.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, still further reserving the point of order, do I understand the gentleman's amendment is to insert after the word "Washington," in line 8, "from his official place of residence"?

Mr. CONNALLY. From his regular place of residence. A further limitation that I would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise to ask of the chairman of the committee what the unexpended balance in this section amounts to, and also, if it would not be out of order, I would like to know what the unexpended balance appropriated in section 9 refers to? I am absolutely opposed to the reappropriation of those unexpended balances, because I do not think the House knows just what it is appropriating when that matter is not gone into more fully. And I would like to ask the chairman—

Mr. PORTER. So far as the boundary commission is concerned, the balance will all be used before the end of the fiscal year. There is an unexpended balance in the emergency fund. Mr. Carr, who appeared before the committee, stated that it would be impossible for him to say how much the unexpended balance would be on account of the nature of the fund. They might have use for \$100,000 or \$200,000 in the next three or four months, and they might not have to use \$100.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, as I said the other day, I think it is very bad practice for this House to appropriate lump sums and also to reappropriate these unexpended balances, because the House is not informed as to what an unexpended balance is going to amount to. And it seems to me if the department asks for a certain amount of money for the next fiscal year we ought to appropriate the definite sum of money that they ask for, or that we think they ought to have, and there ought not to be any doubt in carrying these old accounts from one year after another. For years, since I have been on this Foreign Affairs Committee, these unexpended balances have been carried right along on the books of the department. I do not suppose they have ever been closed at the end of the year, because the reappropriation carries it over to the next year and to the next year after that; and so we go on appropriating unexpended balances in these bills year after year. I think it is very bad practice, and I think we should consider it, and we certainly ought to get out of the habit of appropriating these sums without the knowledge of the House and not knowing just what they amount to.

I felt that I ought to say something about this, and I do hope the committee in its next bill will try to get away from that and try to appropriate, as I have said, definite sums for the various fiscal years in accordance with what the gentlemen think is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how long this commission has been in existence? I think it is beyond my memory entirely, and I would like to know how long it is.

Mr. PORTER. I want to say it was provided by a convention in 1903.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Some 16 or 17 years ago, then?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Are they ever going to get through?

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will answer him.

The commissioner has done a splendid piece of work. He has completed all of the field work. The line has all been monumentalized, with the exception of possibly two or three months of work. All of the data are now in Washington, and they are assembling it so as to make the necessary maps. The commissioner impressed the members of the committee with the fact that he was extremely efficient and extremely diligent.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is there but one commissioner now?

Mr. PORTER. Just one; yes, sir.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has not, as I understand, fully answered my question as to when they would be through?

Mr. PORTER. I asked the commissioner that question, and he said he thought it would take three or four years to complete the office work and assemble all of this data and put it in the form of maps so that the official report could be made.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What is the salary of the commissioner?

Mr. PORTER. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I am not surprised that it will be continued for three or four years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU AT BRUSSELS FOR THE REPRESSION OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.

To meet the share of the United States in the expense of the special bureau created by article 82 of the general act concluded at Brussels July 2, 1890, for the repression of the African slave trade and the restriction of the importation into and sale in a certain defined zone of the African Continent of firearms, ammunition, and spirituous liquors for the year 1921, \$125.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] and to the House, and especially to the gentleman on my right here, that I made some very honest and hearty efforts, unavailing though they were, to help in the economy program, reducing items when I was sure they ought not to be in here, or could be cut out or reduced. I want to make one more effort, and if the committee does not feel that it should respond to these appeals for economy, I shall give up, the same as Mr. MONDELL, and let the gentleman take charge himself.

I am in sympathy with this bill, and I think that the committee has done fine work, and I hope that the committee will receive some credit for it and that the Secretary of State will not get all the credit for this economy. I realize that we must have far more appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service now than in prewar times, and the committee has given a very strong and convincing argument in its report as to why we should. I greatly sympathize with them in their statement, and I am speaking sincerely now. [Laughter.]

The reasons for the large increase of appropriations over prewar times are threefold, as contained in the report. First, in the prewar period we were frequently a debtor nation. Now we are the biggest creditor nation in the world, holding the obligations of other nations in the sum of \$11,000,000,000 and upward—all under a Democratic administration. For the 40 or 50 years of the Republican administrations we were unfortunately a debtor nation. Now, under Woodrow Wilson, a Democratic administration—and this committee in its report is absolutely right about that—we are the largest creditor nation in the world. I want our Democratic friends to put a peg there. That is one great change in our international relations.

Mr. BAER. Can the gentleman assure us that we will get our money back?

Mr. KITCHIN. I can not yield. The second reason that is given for these increased appropriations is that in the prewar period we were without a merchant marine. To-day we have over 6,000,000 tons of shipping flying the American flag and carrying the products of the industries and farms of America to all the markets of the world. For 40 or 50 years of Republican rule less than 10 per cent of our American products were sent abroad in American bottoms. More than 90 per cent of American products were sent out to the markets of the world in foreign bottoms, foreign ships flying the foreign flag. But to-day, under a Democratic administration, this committee in its report solemnly assures us that our merchant marine has grown from nothing to 6,000,000 tons, a larger tonnage than any nation except Great Britain. Every man ought to be proud of this wonderful accomplishment of the Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The third reason the committee give for these increased appropriations is that we practically now control the gold supply of the world. For 40 or 50 years, under Republican rule, we were borrowing money from abroad to get enough gold to run our own domestic industries and enterprises; but now, to-day, under Democratic control, we own and control the gold supply of the world, and every Nation on earth must come to this great United States and ask us to lend them gold—a great accomplishment of the Democratic administration. I know that if the committee had thought about it one minute they never would have put that in the report. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWNE. How does the national debt compare now with our debt under a Republican administration?

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, on account of Republican votes during this Democratic administration our debt, incurred to win the war, has risen considerably; not as much as the Republicans wanted it to rise, because they voted for greater appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more to get on to my amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes to speak on his amendment. [Laughter.] Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I have an amendment here. I now see the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] present. I was going to send for him. Here is another item where we can economize.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir. Here is an item that we can reduce to some extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KITCHIN: Page 12, line 19, strike out "\$125" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120."

[Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, gentlemen, I have been fighting here for economy for four hours to help out the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. I have tried to save \$200,000 in one item, and \$150,000 in another item, and \$138,000 in still another, and I have made up my mind that if I can not save \$5 out of this bill I should give up and let the gentleman from Wyoming take charge of the whole thing and economize as well as he can. [Laughter.]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that that is a treaty obligation?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, well, I will not violate any treaty in the world. If it is a treaty obligation, I am evidently mistaken in my amendment. If not, I appeal to you let us save \$5, at least. [Laughter.] If this is a treaty obligation and we have solemnly bound ourselves to the countries of the world, as it were, in a league of nations to pay \$125 a year to repress the African slave trade and keep liquor from going into a certain zone in Africa, I will not ask this House and my Democratic friends to help me violate a solemn treaty obligation. No, sir; I am more afraid the Republicans would vote to cut it down anyway. Maybe they would, with the gentleman from Wyoming overlording this committee completely. [Laughter.]

I want to say to the gentleman from Wyoming, if I may be permitted to say so in my five minutes, that during his absence this committee has violated every tenet of economy in the gentleman's program. They have failed to vote for a single amendment cutting down a single appropriation.

Now, I shall have to leave. I hope the gentleman from Wyoming will take this job and keep up with it, and wherever amendments ought to be offered to reduce items in the bill I hope he will offer. I suggest one place where he can offer an amendment that will result in economy. The appropriation provided for this post allowance is \$600,000. That was put in there in order to enable the department to increase secretaries' salaries so as to keep pace with the rise in the cost of living, but that was done before we increased the salaries of the secretaries. Now that we have increased the secretaries' salaries a thousand dollars each, which amounts to \$130,000, the gentleman from Wyoming can, and in good conscience no doubt he will, offer an amendment when we reach that page, page 22, to reduce the appropriation of \$600,000 to \$470,000, which would save \$130,000. That is perfectly just, perfectly right, and perfectly in accordance with the program of economy. Now, gentlemen, I am not going to try to help you any more in your economy program. You threw me down the very first thing, and I am not going to have anything more to do with you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] to strike out "\$125" and insert "\$120."

Mr. KITCHIN. Since somebody has reminded me that this \$125 is in conformity with a solemn treaty obligation, I do not want to put myself in the light of trying to violate a treaty, because I am going to help to keep it in good faith, and I respectfully withdraw the amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, I am very much disappointed in the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. I just came into the House to aid him in his worthy effort to reduce this bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. We lost the opportunity to reduce it that many thousands while the gentleman was absent.

Mr. MONDELL. I have just come in, only to find the gentleman occupying the time of the House in an effort to reduce the bill \$125.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Five dollars.

Mr. MONDELL. Five dollars. He now asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion.

Mr. KITCHIN. To keep the treaty.

Mr. MONDELL. I am very painfully disappointed, but under the circumstances I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. KREIDER. Reserving the right to object, I think it is unreasonable and unfair to the representatives of the Democratic Party on the floor of the House to stop their agitation for economy in the usual Democratic way. Whenever there is a chance to cut off \$5 we see them on the job, but when there is a chance to save \$5,000,000—

Mr. KITCHIN. We are still on the job.

Mr. KREIDER. They forget that they are present. If the \$5,000,000 is to be saved, it is up to the Republicans to save it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object— [Laughter.]

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. KREIDER. I think we should have a vote on this amendment, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made to withdrawing the amendment. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do this because the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] in his last speech called attention to the fact that in the report of the chairman of this committee it was pointed out that we had long been a debtor nation and that now we are a creditor nation to the extent of about \$11,000,000,000. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] seemed to think the credit for that ought to belong to the Democratic Party. He further pointed to the item in the report which refers to the increased shipping that is flying the American flag on the seas, and again he wanted to lay claim for the credit for that to the Democratic Party.

I want sincerely to ask the gentleman from North Carolina, Does he also claim credit for the Democratic Party for the 70,000 graves of American manhood, the cleanest, purest, and brightest that ever lived under the Stars and Stripes? Does the Democratic Party want credit for those 70,000 graves, those 70,000 boys, in each of whose homes there is a vacant chair? Does the gentleman from North Carolina want to claim credit for the Democratic Party for the fact that there are over 100,000 boys in this country compelled to go through life without an arm or without a leg or with their faces disfigured beyond recognition? It seems to me that the gentleman from North Carolina has been in Congress too long and occupies too high a place in the esteem of the public, not only among the Democrats but, may I advise him, among the Republicans as well, to make light of a bill of this kind and to treat with ridicule and burlesque a thing that ought to be sacred to every American. As far as giving the Democratic Party credit for our being a creditor nation, there were many millions of Americans who were not Democrats who gave just as loyally of their sons and just as generously of their dollars in order that the Great War might be won with the minimum of sacrifice. The immediate and unusual prosperity that has come to America is not due to any act passed by the Democratic Party while in power. It is due to a disaster, to a calamity that struck the human race, and I deplore the fact, as a member of the opposite party, that the gentleman should allow his words to go out to this country in a spirit of jest, because many a mother will say, "I wonder if I owe to the Democratic Party the sacrifice of my son?"

Mr. KITCHIN. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. PORTER. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this item close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that I only claimed credit for what the report gives us credit for. I do not claim credit for the Democratic Party for the 100,000 Americans who were killed over there or for the nearly 200,000 who were wounded. Who ever heard me claiming any credit for the Democratic Party for that? If I had had my way, not one of them would have been killed or wounded. I so voted, but practically every Republican in the House, as well as every Democrat in the House voted for the war. It was not a Democratic war. It was not a Republican war. It was an American war, and of course I will not give credit for it to either party. I think the Republican Party is entitled to as much credit for the 100,000 men who were killed or died and for the 200,000 men who were wounded as the Democratic Party, and I have not tried to take any credit from the Republican Party on that. But I will tell you what we Democrats do claim credit for. When those 200,000 boys came back—boys with arms and legs shot off or with eyes shot out—and the question before this House was how to rehabilitate those boys, your party almost to a man voted against a \$4,000,000 appropriation, while we Democrats voted for \$4,000,000 to help make life worth living for those boys. [Applause.] We do claim that we have done and will continue to do all in our power to help these maimed, crippled boys. We sent them abroad to risk their lives and limbs, and when they were brought back here wounded and maimed I do want to resent and protest against the action of the Republicans in Congress in refusing to give them the little pittance of \$4,000,000 to help rehabilitate them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

The judge of the said court and the district attorney shall, when the sessions of the court are held at other cities than Shanghai, receive in addition to their salaries their necessary actual expenses during such sessions, not to exceed \$8 per day each, and so much as may be necessary for said purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, is hereby appropriated, \$30,400: *Provided*, That in probate and administration proceedings there shall be collected by said clerk, before entering the order of final distribution, to be paid into the Treasury of the United States, the same inheritance taxes from time to time collected under the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States from the estates of decedents residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 17, after the colon strike out balance of paragraph and insert:

"*Provided*, That hereafter in each private and administration proceeding in said courts there shall be, and is hereby, levied on each respective estate and there shall be assessed and collected by the clerk of the court before entering the order of final distribution, to be paid into the Treasury of the United States, as fees of court, an amount of money equal to the amount of inheritance taxes that would be due and collectible under the laws of the United States in the case of the estate of a decedent who resided within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States of an equal value."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, to that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Ohio that the language already contained in the bill has been made in order by a special rule. The amendment which I offer does not change the effect.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, yes; the amendment uses the word "hereafter," which makes it not in order. I am simply reserving the point of order. I do not know that I will make it.

Mr. GARNER. The word "hereafter" makes it permanent law.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that, and that is one reason why I offer the amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That makes it subject to a point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman may be correct about that. I am not a parliamentary expert. My object in offering the amendment is to make clear what I think was the intention of the committee in drafting this provision. It seems to me that, although we call these amounts fees of courts, in a sense it is really the levy of inheritance taxes prevailing in the United States on the estates of decedents whose estates are administered by the United States Court for China. It seems to me that we ought to make it clear that Congress is levying it and collecting it according to the same standards that prevail in the United States. The language used in the bill is:

Provided, That in probate and administration proceedings there shall be collected by said clerk, before entering the order of final distribution, to be paid into the Treasury of the United States, the same inheritance

taxes from time to time collected under the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States from the estates of decedents residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

I believe that if the chairman of the committee will consider the language of my amendment he will have no objection to it. I can see no reason why these citizens who reside in China and whose estates pay no inheritance tax by reason of the residence of the decedents in China should not contribute to the expenses of maintaining the court in China. I can see no reason why they should not be forced to pay their share of the administration of the United States court in China.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not understand this provision. The probate administration proceedings are upon the estates of whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. American citizens residing in China.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They would not be citizens of the United States unless they were residents of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. They might be; there are a great many people, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, who have property in China and are American citizens. I will say that the United States court for China was established through treaty relations with China which expressly confer upon that court jurisdiction not only over the estates but over persons of American citizens, residents in China. The Chinese laws have no jurisdiction over American citizens in China.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is true; but the jurisdiction of the court will depend upon the settled principles that apply to citizens of this country. I should suppose that a man's citizenship in this country would depend somewhat on his intention as to coming back here.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa—he is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means—if the Federal inheritance tax now in force could be collected from an estate of an American citizen residing in China. And I would like to observe that if it does not, this amendment ought to be adopted, because they ought to pay an inheritance tax—I mean a Federal inheritance tax, the same as the estate of an American citizen residing in the United States would pay.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman on that; but the point I raised, and which I am not absolutely sure about, is one upon which I would like information. At first blush it seems to me as if the whole proviso was not necessary. However, it may be necessary.

Mr. CONNALLY. We had the judge of the United States court for China before us, and he gave it as his opinion that the Federal inheritance-tax law did not apply to American citizens residing in China. It was on his approval and at his suggestion that the committee inserted this language in the bill, in order that the inheritance tax from the estates of American citizens might be paid and help to defray the expenses of that court and maintain the court.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have not examined personally into the subject, and I will yield to the judgment of the judge of the court for China and the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say that the rules of the House provide that the paragraph be permitted to remain in the bill, and it may be perfected by a germane amendment; but that does not permit an amendment which would add additional legislation. It has been held that an amendment on all fours with this was out of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment with the word "hereafter" stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not make the ruling on the word "hereafter," but on the general proposition that it adds new legislation to the existing legislation in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the attention of the Chair been called to the language of the bill as it stands on page 16? That is new legislation, if the Chair please, and that was made in order this morning by the special rule.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only reason the gentleman's amendment would be in order, if it is germane.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to know wherein it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not hold that it is not germane. The Chair simply holds that while it is germane, it adds new legislation to the legislation carried on page 16 of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will examine that language he will see that the intended effect of the language is identical. It simply changes the language in order to make it clearer how the clerk will arrive at the amount which

he shall be required to collect in each case. The effect of it is identically the same, and if the language on page 16, as contained in the printed bill, is in order, there can be no question on earth that my amendment is in order. Since the Chair holds that the word "hereafter" does not render it out of order, I insist that my original amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets very much to be obliged to differ with the gentleman. If this were on a legislative bill, the Chair thinks that he would hold the amendment to be in order, but this is an appropriation bill, and what applies to a legislative bill does not apply to an appropriation bill. Anything that adds new legislation to the pending section under the rules of the House can not be in order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. I move to amend, in line 17, by striking out the figures "\$30,400" and inserting as a new paragraph at the bottom of the page the words and figures "Total, \$30,400." That is simply an oral change, so as to have the item showing the total carried at the end of the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 17, strike out the figures "\$30,400" and at the bottom of the page insert a new paragraph, as follows:
"Total, \$30,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the International High Commission arising in such work and investigations as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why this has been changed from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of State. In the current law, if I read it correctly, it says that this expenditure shall be made under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee considered that matter very carefully and concluded it would be better to make the expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of State on account of its diplomatic character. It was formerly under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. TILSON. The bill provides—

arising in such work and investigation as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

It was formerly under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and expenses, including salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the commissioners on the part of the United States, with the approval solely of the Secretary of State, including rental of offices at Washington, D. C., expense of printing, and necessary traveling expenses, and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the International Joint Commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada and for other purposes, signed January 11, 1909, \$25,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subsistence of the commission or secretary, except for actual and necessary expenses, not in excess of \$8 per day each, when absent from Washington on official business: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for salaries of commissioners in excess of \$3,500 each per annum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 19, line 12, by inserting after the word "Washington" the words "and from his regular place of residence." It is the same amendment that I offered to the other commission.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the word "Washington," insert "and from his regular place of residence."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses of interpreters to consulates and guards.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend in line 3, page 23, by inserting the words "and guards" after the word "interpreters," and by striking out in line 4 the words "and guards."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 23, line 3, after the word "interpreters," insert the words "and guards," and in line 4, strike out the words "and guards."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interpreters and guards to be employed at consulates, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$103,700.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the reason for this expenditure and for the employment of interpreters to courts and consulates? Is that to China, Japan, and Siberia?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. And in the Turkish dominions?

Mr. PORTER. Yes. We lumped the two items.

Mr. TILSON. Last year there were two items, and the result is different.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. We were requested to increase it by \$15,000 by the Secretary of State, for very good reasons, which he stated. It is an increase of only \$15,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, there are a good many places outside of the oriental countries where expert linguistic assistance is required. For example, take the new Republic of Yugoslavia. That is made up of several different peoples, who are linguistically different. A man to be an efficient and useful officer at that legation is expected to speak six different languages. It is exceedingly difficult to get a man who can fulfill those requirements anywhere. We have insisted from year to year in this bill that Americanizing of the service shall go forward just as fast as possible. But in some places, such as the one I have cited, and in the Orient, it has been practically impossible to get the right sort of Americans who could speak several languages. In order to overcome that situation the State Department asked this year for a new item for salary of alien employees, amounting to \$50,000, so that here and there throughout the capitals of the world it might be able to procure competent alien subordinates. The committee was not inclined to broaden the capacity of the State Department to go afield and hire alien employees to any great extent. But the representations of the State Department were so urgent as to certain places which are to be raised to legation or embassy rank, as a result of the war, or at which consulates have been or may be established, that we concluded that we could help out the State Department without deviating from our principle by increasing this interpreter item by \$15,000.

So the actual effect of the committee action was to cut down by \$35,000 net the estimate of the State Department.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has not explained why in the current law it is specified that the expenditure is to be made at certain places, naming some 8 or 10 of them. Now, it is combined into one item, and no place whatever is named, so it might be expended anywhere over the whole world.

Mr. ROGERS. The fund is not a very large one, and of course the need of interpreters is limited to a relatively few portions of the world. It seemed to us that a certain degree of fluidity or elasticity could not do any harm to the service and might make more effective operation possible. Therefore we simply grouped the three items into one, so far as the amount asked for was concerned, and then cut \$35,000 from the total.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman a question in reference to an item we passed and a claim that is made by the chairman. I notice in the report the chairman filed that he stated the post-allowances estimate by the State Department was \$1,800,000.

Mr. PORTER. That is a mistake of the printer. He made a mistake of a million dollars.

Mr. FLOOD. Then the difference in the estimates of the State Department and the amount carried by this bill is less by one million—

Mr. PORTER. No; the totals are correct. The original manuscript which I sent to the printer shows \$800,000, but the printer made it \$1,800,000, and it was too late to change it.

Mr. FLOOD. The total of \$11,913,000 is correct?

Mr. PORTER. It is not included in the total. The \$800,000 is included in the total.

Mr. FLOOD. Then the amount stated in the total is correct?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES, PASSPORT-CONTROL ACT.

For expenses of regulating entry into the United States, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, and Public Act No. 79 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, when the latter act shall have become effective, \$250,000, in addition to the remaining \$150,000 of the sum appropriated by section 4 of said Public Act No. 79.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNALLY: Page 23, line 23, at the end of the paragraph insert:

"Provided, That a fee of \$5 shall be collected for each citizen's passport issued from the Department of State, and a similar fee for each visé by United States diplomatic or consular officers on each foreign passport, to be applied by the Secretary of State to create a fund for the carrying into effect of the purposes of this paragraph and the reduction of the sum therein appropriated."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with the announced intention of the committee to adopt measures to reduce expenditures and to adopt a policy of economy. All of us ought to exercise the most strict economy of which we are capable. As Representatives it is our solemn duty to do so. While this item appropriates \$250,000 in addition to an unexpended balance of \$150,000 already appropriated for carrying into effect the passport control act, if the House will adopt the amendment which I propose and which I really believe a goodly number of gentlemen on the committee favor, every dollar of this \$400,000 appropriation will remain in the United States Treasury and not one cent will have to be expended.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there not a fee now of \$2?

Mr. CONNALLY. One dollar. The present fee, Mr. Chairman, is only \$1 for each passport, and a dollar for the viséing of a foreign passport when presented to our consuls and diplomatic officers in foreign lands.

Mr. ROGERS. The fee is \$2 in each case, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Here is the statute on the subject. I have it before me. The gentleman from Massachusetts is no doubt confused by the fact that when a person makes an application for a passport away from Washington he is required to pay 50 cents for an affidavit and the clerk of the court 50 cents. But that does not go to the State Department at all.

Mr. ROGERS. One dollar for the department and another dollar either to the State court or the Federal court where the application is made.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. ROGERS. The application is made before the Federal court and goes into the Federal Treasury, but in the case of the visé, which is covered under this paragraph, the unvarying fee is \$2, according to the testimony before the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that only \$1 goes into the Federal Treasury for the issuance of a passport. The other goes to a notary public or clerk, or somebody. The testimony before our committee discloses, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the Secretary favors an increase of the passport fee, and Mr. Carr, of the consular department, suggested that by increasing these fees the expenses of the department could be materially reduced. In the hearings on page 24, Part I, Mr. Carr testified:

Mr. ROGERS. In the earlier hearings before the committee.

Mr. CARR. The passport bureau itself is collecting fees at the rate of—for instance, it issued passports at the rate of 150,000 a year here in Washington.

Secretary LANSING. I think you could make a considerable increase.

Mr. CARR. It used to be \$5 and it was reduced to \$1.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if you really want to economize, if you will adopt this amendment it will bring into the Treasury of the United States more, I believe, than \$1,000,000. The bill appropriates in this one item \$400,000. To do what? To compensate clerks and employees in foreign countries. To do what? To visé passports for foreigners who are desirous of coming to the United States. Now, I believe that the Congress of the United States is justified in assuming an attitude with reference to such foreigners that will require them to contribute at least a part of the expense of maintaining that service, and it will not be contended that it is not worth \$5 to secure the visé of a passport in a foreign country. In the case of our own citizens who travel in foreign lands, most of them either go there for business purposes or on

pleasure trips; and in their case, I submit to this committee, they are more than able to pay the small sum of \$5 for a passport. The Government of the United States is now expending stupendous sums in maintaining the passport bureau and in maintaining its agencies in foreign countries. I believe if the members of the majority in this House are sincere in their desire for economy, if they really believe we ought to reduce expenses, if they believe that all the money ought not to go out of the Treasury, but at least a little ought to be brought into the Treasury, this amendment should be adopted. I want to say to the gentleman—

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?
Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS. I understood the gentleman to say that the Secretary of State had testified before the committee that he believed in this increase. My recollection is otherwise. I wondered if the gentleman could refer to the page of the testimony.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think I could if the gentleman would give me a little more time.

Mr. ROGERS. The testimony on this point appears on pages 23 and 24 of part 1 of the hearings, and, so far as I know, that is the only place where this subject has been discussed by the Secretary.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is in the hearings. I looked it up last night. I remember it distinctly. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings, part 1, page 24, I think he will find the statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to submit some remarks on the point of order. I assume that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], who I believe it was reserved the point of order, will urge the Chair to hold the amendment not in order, because it is legislation; but I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that under the Holman rule anything that reduces an appropriation, even though it be in its nature legislative, is in order on a general appropriation bill.

By the exact language of the amendment itself it directs that these sums be applied by the Secretary of State to create a fund—to do what? To carry out the purpose of this section and reduce this appropriation. What else do we find? We find in the hearings the testimony that here in Washington at least 150,000 passports are issued each year. An increase from \$1 to \$5 would make quite an increase in revenue. Four dollars per head for 150,000 passports would amount to \$600,000, a sum more than sufficient to wipe out the entire sums appropriated in this particular section. This is without taking into account the great number in foreign countries.

I want to call the attention of the Chair to a fact that will not be disputed. Under existing law the fee for issuing passports is only \$1. Under the Holman rule it seems to me obvious that this amendment is in order, because its effect is to reduce the appropriation and to reduce the expenditures by reason of this particular provision.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. The gentleman says the only charge now is \$1?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I was at the Department of State on day before yesterday with some friends, and I saw them pay for a passport. The bill presented was \$2.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from West Virginia was not in the Hall a moment ago when I explained that only \$1 goes to the Federal Government. The other 50 cents is for a notary fee and 50 cents for other expenses.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I am glad to be informed.

Mr. CONNALLY. It seems to me this would not impose a burden on the person applying for a passport. I am not urging this as a partisan, but I am urging it here as a Representative, believing that when we have an opportunity to thus easily bring into the Treasury of the United States more than a million dollars, which will materially assist in defraying the expenses of maintaining this service, we ought not to hesitate to do so. I very much hope that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] will not make the point of order.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am wondering, in view of the discussion by the gentleman, and in view of the fact that this whole question was discussed in the committee, why it is that the gentleman did not present some sort of provision of this kind when the bill was up for consideration before the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] did bring the matter up.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. My recollection is that the whole matter was to be left pending, for time to include this, as well as other matters, in the way of new legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I said a moment ago, I am not urging this as a partisan matter. I thought the gentleman had in mind some permanent legislation.

If objection is to be made to the amendment on the ground that its effect will be to make permanent the raise in passport fees from \$1 to \$5, I shall be content that the amendment be so modified as to make it operative for the life of the present appropriation bill.

I shall within the next few days introduce a bill providing by permanent law that passport and visé fees shall be \$5 instead of \$1.

The records of the Department of State disclose that passports are being now issued at Washington at the average rate of 156,000 per year. Before the war immigrants were arriving in the United States on an average of about 1,000,000 annually. At the present time the average is 540,000 per year.

Fees on the present average issuance of passports and inspection of passports of aliens will bring into the Treasury nearly three and one-half millions of dollars annually.

When conditions of foreign travel become more settled hundreds of thousands more tourists will leave the United States to visit foreign countries within the next year or two. An increasing number of other citizens will go abroad in connection with foreign trade. Each of them will spend hundreds of dollars on each trip, and a passport fee of \$5 will be a mere bagatelle as compared with the expense of such trip and will in no case deter a single individual from embarking on such a journey. Foreigners will apply to our consulates and embassies in foreign countries to have their passports examined and approved for entry into the United States. The passport fee of \$5 will be to them, as compared with the expenses of their voyage, a mere trifle.

However, in the aggregate the fees if increased will bring into the Treasury of the United States annually about two and a quarter million dollars more than now received, to assist in defraying the expenses of maintaining the passport control system.

American consulates, legations, and embassies are maintained in foreign lands for purposes of maintaining international relations and for the convenience of American citizens and for the protection of their rights as they relate to foreign countries.

This service in its larger aspect is national in its character. It pertains to the welfare of the whole people and the prestige of our country. It involves the possibilities of peace and war and trade and commerce as they may be affected by our relations to the other nations of the earth.

But as to that portion of the foreign service that deals with the issuance of passports it may be said that this is a service particularly enjoyed by those of our citizens who journey abroad. Is it not fair and equitable that they should make at least a slight contribution to its maintenance in the payment of a small fee for a service which to them is of great value and usefulness? Is it not just that foreigners intending to journey to the United States should be required to pay a reasonable fee for a service which facilitates their entry into the United States?

It has been urged that the raising of the passport fee constitutes the levy of a tax. That is only partially true, and yet if it were wholly true is not a valid or persuasive argument against the amendment. A passport fee is a tax only in a sense that it is a tax upon those individuals who derive a particular and peculiar benefit or privilege not enjoyed by the public at large. It is only a requirement that the enjoyment of a special service shall entail on those so enjoying it the duty to at least partially compensate the Government for the expenses incurred in rendering the service.

The fees collected through an increase in the raise will make it possible for the tax laws to bear a little more lightly in some other form or feature. The fees collected by the Department of State for passports will operate to very materially reduce the expenses of that department and to reduce the amounts which otherwise would have to be appropriated out of the General Treasury.

If the Congress really desires to lighten the tax burden, if gentlemen of the majority party in truth desire to be economical in the financial affairs of the United States, they now have an opportunity to put into practice their pretensions by the adoption of this amendment. A little later they will have another opportunity of justifying their widely heralded profession by passing the bill which I propose to introduce raising the passport fees from \$1 to \$5.

At this time when the national expenditures are so stupendous in their proportions, when unprecedented sums in the form of taxes must be laid upon the people of the United States to maintain the various agencies of government established for the protection of the rights of the people of the United States and the convenience of its citizens, the Congress should exercise the most careful and painstaking economy in the fiscal affairs of the Government.

Gentlemen, will you refuse or decline to accept this concrete, tangible proposal to bring money into the Federal Treasury from a source that can contribute it without inconvenience. Here is an opportunity to bring money into the Treasury and not to take it out of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts make the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS. I propose to make it, and if the Chair is in doubt I would like to be heard on it. I want to say one word, however, before the point of order is made. There may be a great deal of merit in the fundamental proposal of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. On the other hand, I was present during the entire discussion, when the Secretary of State and his assistants were before the committee, on these matters and allied matters. I listened very carefully, and I have no recollection whatever that the Secretary of State advocated larger fees. I do not know what the plan of the chairman of the committee may be, but I assume that he would say in a matter of this importance, where the policy of the country has been otherwise for a good many years, that we should go into this specifically and carefully and take testimony from all sides, and then, if so decided, bring a substantive proposal before the House. For that reason and for that reason only, and without seeking to prejudge the matter adversely, I make the point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard a moment solely on the point of order. I submit to the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is clearly in order under our rules. It is legislation, it is true, and apart from the Holman rule it would be out of order. Further it will not be in order under the Holman rule, unless this particular provision of law proposed by the gentleman from Texas, will operate to bring about a reduction in the amount carried in the bill. If it brings about a reduction in the amount carried in the bill, then it comes clearly and absolutely within the Holman rule. It is not necessary for an amendment to be in order, that it shall be directed to the reduction of some particular item in the bill. It is enough if the proposition that is proposed, in the judgment of the Chair, will in its operation fairly operate by its own force to bring about a reduction of expenditures. Speaker Kerr and Chairman W. L. Wilson both ruled that the purpose of the Holman rule is most beneficent and proper, and the rule should have a liberal construction. (Hinds', vol. 4, p. 594.)

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this legislation will operate to furnish an additional fund, and thereby reduce the present amount required from the Treasury.

This amendment will provide a fund from new sources, that will render unnecessary the full amount of the appropriation of \$250,000 which the bill now carries. The fund to be provided by the legislation contained in the amendment is set aside for application to the very objects provided for in the specific appropriation of \$250,000.

Permit me to call the attention of the Chair to the following citation from Fourth Hinds' (RECORD, 1st sess., 52d Cong., p. 1792) from a ruling made on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, Judge De Armond. I desire specifically to call attention to the fact that the effect of this amendment was nothing like so apparent on its face as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The amendment of Judge De Armond was to a pension appropriation bill and consisted merely of these words, "was, or other." The effect of the amendment was to increase the number of persons prohibited from receiving the benefits of a clause in the pension law, thereby as a necessary sequence reducing the number of pensioners. The point was made that the amendment did not show on its face that it reduced expenditures. But it was easy to see that a reduction in the number of pensioners, necessarily reduced the amount that would be required for the payment of pensions, though the amendment was not directed to the amount of money actually appropriated by the bill. The amendment was held to be in order under the Holman rule.

While it was not specifically directed to reducing the amount of money carried in the bill for the payment of pensions, the Chair was justified in concluding—and in order to make his ruling he had to so conclude—that in the execution of the pension laws the amount required for the payment of pensions would be reduced by the effect of the amendment.

I thoroughly agree that it is not in order to propose legislation on an appropriation bill, and at the same time reduce the amount carried in the bill, when the legislation is not related to and does not effect the reduction. In such a case the legislation is not in order. The legislation itself must effect a reduction. It must appear to the Chair that it will effect a reduction. If the Chair is satisfied from the law of the land, the evidence in the hearings, and his knowledge of public affairs that in consequence of the legislation proposed a reduction will be effected, then the amendment will come within the Holman rule. This principle can not be gainsaid.

This is an appropriation for \$250,000 for definite purposes. The gentleman from Texas proposes legislation which will raise a fund that will be applied to the same purposes, and to the extent of the new fund raised by the taxation provided by this amendment, the amount of the present appropriation may be reduced. It will therefore effect, so far as the bill is concerned, a reduction in the amount carried in this bill, because the amendment is directly applied to the very purpose of creating a new fund by new taxation for the payment of the expenses provided for by the present appropriation. Hence, the legislation being related to the reduction, and the chairman knowing the public business of the country, knowing the laws of the land, and knowing the very large number of persons that will be chargeable by the increased taxation proposed is in a position to say that in his judgment a reduction will be effected by the legislation proposed and that therefore the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, just a word on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Much as I respect the opinion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] upon all parliamentary questions I can not agree that the Chair is permitted to exercise such broad discretion as he now contends as to the probable effect of legislation upon the reduction of expenses. For instance, where in this bill an appropriation is provided to pay our share of the expenses of the Palace of Peace at The Hague, it occurs to me that under the gentleman's contention it would be germane under the Holman rule to offer a provision that a certain admission fee should be charged to the Peace Palace at The Hague, on the theory that the expenses of the United States in keeping up its share of the expense would be reduced. That is a far cry. It seems to me the Holman rule never contemplated to go so far as that, but that the rule in its essence must be construed strictly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Upon what earthly principle, except the principle I have undertaken to state, was the De Armond amendment held to be in order, simply the addition of the words "was or other"?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I concede that the gentleman has a precedent there which is very much in point.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I can cite many more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But I also say to the gentleman that I have studied pretty thoroughly the precedents on the Holman rule, and I think the gentleman can find under that rule a precedent for almost anything he desires.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; not at all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Because, after all, it is left to the discretion of the Chair, and I do not think too much should be left to the discretion of the Chair. I do not think the Chair should be left to do too much guessing.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I agree to that. Unless the Chair is reasonably satisfied as an intelligent man, from his knowledge of public affairs and the application of this amendment to the business of the country, that it is going to produce this fund and thereby bring about a reduction in the expense, then the amendment is not in order. But he has only to apply the principle of the De Armond amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In such a case as that, the Chair might believe that if an additional amount were charged for the issuance of a passport there might be as many passports issued at \$5 apiece as at \$1 apiece, but the gentleman can not say for a certainty that fewer applications might not be made for passports at \$5 apiece than at \$1. It is a guess on the part of the Chairman, and is bound to be—and I am one of those who believe it is the duty of the Chair to construe the Holman rule strictly—that he must not engage in any speculation whatever. It must be apparent to him as a man of common sense that an actual saving will be made by virtue of the legislation proposed, or the amendment is not in order, and I do not think it necessarily follows here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The law now provides that a fee of \$1 shall be charged and collected for each passport issued from the State Department. We have before us the paragraph of the bill providing for the expenses of regulating entry into the United States in accordance with the provisions of an act passed on the 22d of May, 1918, and to carry that act into effect. That act provides that the power shall be given to the Secretary of State to regulate the issuance of passports and, as the Chair understands it, in a measure to limit the number of people who enter the United States. The gentleman from Texas proposes an amendment now to the appropriation which is made to carry out the provisions of that act, which amendment provides that a fee of \$5 shall be collected for each passport issued by the Department of State, and he contends that if the amendment is adopted it will reduce the amount of the appropriation on its face.

Clause 2 of Rule XXI of the House provides that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

The law further provides that no such amendment shall be in order unless reported by a committee of the House having jurisdiction over the subject.

It must be apparent to the members of the committee that there is nothing on the face of this amendment to indicate a reduction in the amount of the appropriation. Of course, it is true that if the amendment should be adopted it would raise revenue, but the revenue would go into the Treasury to the credit of the general fund, and there is nobody here wise enough to say what that revenue would be appropriated for. It might not be appropriated for the payment of the expenses of the State Department at all; and on the face of the facts as the Chair sees them, he can not see any possibility of the reduction of the amount of the appropriation on its face resulting from the amendment of the gentleman from Texas nor can it be said that it will even increase the amount covered into the Treasury. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. PORTER. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question being taken, the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, prior to rising, I want to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion has been carried.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to keep my status.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PORTER. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit, which I desire to offer.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I doubt the right of the gentleman to offer a motion to recommit, unless he is opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. There is no point of order pending. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order against the position taken by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I will state that I think as a member of the committee I ought to make the motion, unless somebody claims a prior right.

The SPEAKER. That is correct, but the Chair has asked the gentleman if he is opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does anyone who is opposed to the bill desire to offer a motion to recommit? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONNALLY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: Page 25, line 22, strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$200,000"; and after line 23, page 25, add the following:

"Provided, That a fee of \$5 shall be collected for each citizen's passport issued from the Department of State, and a similar fee for each visé by the United States Diplomatic and Consular officer on each foreign passport, to be applied by the Secretary of State to create a fund for carrying into effect of the purposes of this paragraph and the reduction of the same therein appropriated."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves the previous question on the motion to recommit, and the gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order. What is the point of order?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, no existing law authorizing the collection of \$5 for passports, the law now providing for \$1.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, although I have recently taken the floor in connection with this point of order, the principle involved is so fundamental that I will ask the indulgence of the Chair for recognition. His ruling in this matter will set a new precedent, with respect to amendments under the Holman rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to state to the Chair that the same amendment was ruled out of order in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio is slightly in error. This is not exactly the same amendment. The gentleman from Texas has modified his amendment to meet, in part, the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not catch what the modifications were.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. He reduces the amount appropriated from \$250,000 to \$200,000. I do not think that is necessary, but if it is necessary, then the necessary correction has been afforded. It was also stated in the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, that the amendment should come from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I submit that this is not necessary. Rule XXI provides in part as follows: "Nor shall any provision in any such bill, or amendment thereto, changing existing law, be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill."

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, but the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

This is an amendment that I submit comes within the benefit of this citation.

The SPEAKER. Is that the only ground on which it is supported by the Holman rule?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I submit, as I said, that this amendment comes within the protection of the rule, because it is an amendment that reduces the amount of money covered by the bill. It is not necessary for an amendment to show upon its face that it effects a reduction. Yet this amendment does make that showing on its face. It is sufficient to make the amendment in order, if it is apparent to the Chair, having in mind the law of the land, his knowledge of the public business, and the reasonably likely effect of the law proposed, that the amendment proposed will fairly operate by its own force to reduce the amount of money covered by the bill.

I call the attention of the Chair to a ruling on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. De Armond, to a pension appropriation bill. There was nothing in his amendment except the words "was, or other." The amendment did not show a reduction upon its face. But it was evident upon consideration of the effect of this language, as applied to existing conditions, that it would operate of its own vigor to reduce the number of pensioners. The fewer the number of pensioners, the less the amount to be appropriated under existing law on pension account. In other words the Chair reasoned the matter out, and drew a conclusion as to the effect of the amendment before ruling. It was not necessary for this conclusion of reduction to be established with the vigor and severity of a mathematical demonstration. It was only necessary for the Chair to conclude that the amendment would fairly operate by its own force to retrench expenditures in one of the ways contemplated by the rule. Unless the chairman had devised this conclusion of reduction from the insertion of the words, "was, or other" in the bill under consideration he could not have held the amendment in order. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (52d Cong., p. 1792). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] contends that this rule ought to be strictly construed. The precedents do not so hold. See ruling of Speaker Kerr and Chairman W. L. Wilson, IV Hinds, 594, that the Holman rule is a beneficent and proper rule, and should have a liberal construction. See also ruling of Chairman Crisp, Manual, p. 507. There are many other precedents to the same effect.

The rule should be both reasonably and liberally construed as stated by Speaker Kerr, and others, because it is in the interest of retrenchment, and in the language of Chairman CRISP, "it is intended to have a beneficial effect upon the Treasury of the United States."

Now, what is the amendment of the gentleman from Texas? He offers an amendment in the way of legislation to create a new fund by increasing the tax upon certain people. While the number of persons to be affected by this tax can not be stated with precise accuracy, yet it is known that it will be very large. It is perfectly competent for the Chair to take knowledge of that fact; it is perfectly competent for the Chair to take knowledge of the fact that an increase in the way of 400 per cent in the tax to be imposed upon these persons will create a very large fund. This fund is to be utilized for the very purposes for which the specific appropriation of \$250,000 is made.

The gentleman from Texas by his amendment sequestrates this fund for these very purposes. The chairman of the committee was in error in holding that this result of reduction would not follow from the amendment, that it did not show on its face that this result would follow. The fund to be raised is directed, as stated, to be used in lieu of the \$250,000 appropriation. And if only a single dollar should be raised by the new taxation in excess of the amount now raised, it would make possible to that extent a reduction in the \$250,000 appropriation. But as a part of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas this appropriation is reduced to \$200,000. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] insists that the Speaker should not guess about this reduction. I agree with him. If it is altogether problematical and uncertain whether any reduction will be effected, the amendment is not in order. But for an amendment to be in order under the Holman principle it is not necessary that the fact of reduction be established beyond a reasonable doubt or with the rigor of a mathematical demonstration. The likelihood of reduction under the legislation proposed is left to the Chairman. If the Chairman, after looking to the whole situation, concludes that reasonably speaking the legislation will operate of its own force to effect a reduction, then that will be sufficient ground upon which to hold that the amendment is in order.

I call the attention of the Chair to rulings under the Holman rule that were made in connection with the Army appropriation bill, rulings which I think were approved by the judgment of the House at that time. In one case an amendment was offered reducing the number of Cavalry regiments from 15 to 10. The Chair held that having reference to known facts, the maintenance of 10 regiments would not require so large a sum as the maintenance of 15 regiments. The Chair could not determine how much reduction would be effected by this cutting down of the number of these regiments, but it was perfectly clear that a reduction would be effected, and this conclusion was neither problematical nor conjectural. It was a reasonable conclusion, fairly certain from the entire body of facts submitted to the Chair, and considered in the light of reason and common sense.

May I call the attention of the Chair to further citations from this particular case?

The precedents say in this connection that the amendment, being in itself a complete piece of legislation, must operate *ex proprio vigore* to effect a reduction of expenditures. The reduction must appear as a

necessary result; that is, it must be apparent to the Chair that the amendment will operate of its own force to effect a reduction. (Manual and Digest, p. 409; Hinds, vol. 4, p. 593.) But is it not necessary for this conclusion of reduction to be established with the rigor and severity of a mathematical demonstration. It is enough if the amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, will fairly operate by its own force to retrench expenditures in one of the three ways indicated. This result must be a necessary result, not a conjectural result or a problematical result. It is true that having reference to the difference of minds, one Chairman might hold that retrenchment would be the necessary result of an amendment, while another Chairman or the committee on appeal might be of a different opinion. But this is inevitable. The law is clear, for instance, that at times a court upon the facts can hold as a matter of law that there was no negligence. Still upon the same facts one court will derive this conclusion, while another court on appeal will reach a different conclusion. (See Manual, p. 509.)

If the Chairman, looking to this amendment which provides for a new fund to be raised by new taxation, and which is set aside to be used for the purposes for which \$250,000 is created, is satisfied that the amount so raised will reduce the amount necessary to be appropriated under this head out of the General Treasury; if he reaches that conclusion, then, under the rulings—and I can cite many of them, but none stronger than those already cited—he should hold that this amendment is in order. Of course, if it is contended that this increase of tax on the vast number of persons that will be affected by the increase will not bring into the Treasury a larger sum than the present rate, and that contention is sustained by the Chair, then the amendment is not in order. But if that suggested contention is sound, then the Ways and Means Committee, which has been raising many rates to raise more funds, has been sadly at fault in that action. But that contention can not be sustained. There is not a man on this floor that is not satisfied that this increase in rate will bring a large additional sum into the Treasury. If so, then the legislation proposed will effect a retrenchment in expenditures and a reduction in the amount of money covered by the bill in this item, to wit, the sum of \$250,000. This being so, and the legislation being responsible for this reduction, it is not necessary to determine the exact amount of the reduction. Any reduction that is appreciable in the amount of money covered by the bill and that is effected by the legislation proposed in the amendment will make that amendment in order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is true that this amendment is not precisely in the same form as offered and ruled out by the Chair on a point of order in the committee. But the difference is a matter of form rather than of substance. I agree, however, with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] in his contention that that makes no difference under his construction of the Holman rule. If under the Holman rule any sort of legislation can be offered to an appropriation bill the result of which may, in the opinion of the Chair, be eventually to decrease that appropriation, he opens up a field so wide that the Holman rule, I think, might be construed to cover any sort of legislation under any circumstances. Now, I believe the Holman rule ought to be construed strictly. I concede, as the gentleman from Virginia says, that its use may be beneficent where it actually curtails expenses. So far, so good, but I see also great danger in a construction of the Holman rule which, under the guise of reducing expenditures, permits legislation on appropriation bills. I am opposed to legislation on appropriation bills, and I think it ought to be guarded most carefully.

Now, take this case. It is contended that the raising of the fee on passports from \$1 to \$5 would increase the revenue and thereby tend to diminish the expense eventually. That may be true. But does anyone contend that it would be in order on the Post Office appropriation bill, for instance, to increase the rate on first-class postage from 2 cents to 5 cents, or from 2 cents to 10 cents—the proportion of increase in this case—on the ground that that increase of itself would eventually result in a decrease of expenditures?

I can not see very much difference between the two. You are raising the fee five times, increasing it by 400 per cent, as my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] says, and the Chair has got to take the view of it that that is going to necessarily decrease expenses, if his view is to be sustained.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker—conceding that you can find almost any precedent for any proposition under the Holman rule if you search the precedents carefully enough—that the Chair is justified in this case in assuming that as a matter of necessity the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is going to result in a decrease of appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not ask for recognition to submit any further remarks on my account, but wish to conclude what I have to say with a citation from a ruling by a gentleman who is regarded by this House as an eminent parliamentarian, Mr. CRISP, of Georgia. It will be found on page 507 of the manual, under the head of Important Decisions. I read:

Now, the Chair, as before stated, believes the Holman rule is intended to have a beneficial effect upon the Treasury of the United States. If the Chair is in doubt about whether or not an amendment is in order, he believes it his duty to resolve that doubt against the point of order, for by so doing the Chair works no hardship upon anyone, but submits to the committee itself the privilege of passing upon the amendment. If the committee favor it, a majority can adopt it. If they are opposed to it, a majority can reject it.

The Chair believes the amendment in question comes clearly within the spirit of the Holman rule.

A number of citations from Hinds' Precedents supporting this ruling will be found on the page of the manual cited above.

The SPEAKER. It is argued that this amendment, which is clearly legislation and therefore out of order, is in order by the terms of the Holman rule. That rule provides—

Not shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States.

This amendment certainly does not do that. Again—

By the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

This certainly does not do that. Then again—

Or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

It must be then under that third clause of the rule that this must be sustained, if sustained at all. It is well settled that the amendment must clearly and certainly and necessarily cause a reduction. But it seems to the Chair that it is impossible for the Chair to be sure that this amendment really and finally reduces the amount of money appropriated in this bill.

To be sure the appropriation is reduced from \$250,000 to \$200,000 on its face; that brings it within the Holman rule. But while the face of the appropriation is thus reduced on the one hand, on the other hand an indefinite increase of the appropriation is made. By the terms of the amendment it is provided that an additional fee—in other words, additional revenue—shall be provided, which shall be put into the same fund from which this appropriation is drawn and which increases that fund by the amount derived from the tax. How much money that tax will produce no one has estimated. Therefore, whether that fund will be larger or smaller than it is now, after this money is collected, it is impossible for the Chair to tell. It may be \$200,000; it may be \$400,000.

It does not seem to the Chair that it is a fair interpretation of the Holman rule to say that by creating a new source of revenue and making a specific appropriation of that revenue, and at the same time reducing the amount which was before appropriated, a real reduction of appropriation is effected. Certainly you are not sure that any economy is secured. The expenses of the United States are not necessarily reduced in any way. On the contrary, it may very well increase them, because if the sum is larger than the original appropriation, then the department has so much more to spend and the outlay of the department would be so much larger. It seems to the Chair that this is not an economy, but on the other hand it might, under the guise of economy, be a very large increase in the expense. It is a novel suggestion that new taxes are economy or lead necessarily to a reduction of expenses. The Chair thinks the amendment does not necessarily reduce the appropriation of this bill and sustains the point of order. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. PORTER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3451. An act authorizing and directing the United States Shipping Board to adjust and pay the claims of wooden-ship builders arising out of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO A COMMITTEE.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] was necessarily called from the Chamber on account of sickness in his family, and he requested me to nominate, to fill a Democratic vacancy on the Committee on Elections No. 1, Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I move that the gentleman nominated be elected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas nominates the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] as a member of the Committee on Elections No. 1, to fill a Democratic vacancy, and moves his election. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] may have five days within which to extend his remarks in connection with the memorial exercises for Mr. TAGSDALE. He was unavoidably absent yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] be given five days in which to extend his remarks in connection with the memorial exercises concerning Mr. TAGSDALE. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have it stated in the RECORD that my colleague, Mr. WHALEY, who is confined to his apartment with the "flu," could not for that reason vote on the bill relating to the increase in the pay of men in the Navy last Friday. If he had been here, he would have voted aye.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by enumerating still further citations from the opinions of Judge CHASE, which I cited, and other citations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the citations referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 27, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting request for change in the wording of estimates for "Repairs and preservation of public buildings," so as to include buildings controlled by the Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 637); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report showing the number of documents received and distributed by the Treasury Department in the past calendar year; to the Committee on Printing.

3. A letter from the president of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway, transmitting report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the 12 months ending December 31, 1919; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FULLER of Illinois, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12012) concerning the administration of the pension laws in claims for pension of persons who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War, and by the widows of such persons, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 585), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 587), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 12077) to amend section 6 of the Federal-aid road act; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 12078) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditures," approved February 23, 1917; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 449) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives certain information regarding the mutiny on board the U. S. S. *America*; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 12079) granting an increase of pension to Adella Doersh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 12080) to advance Capt. Benjamin S. Berry to the permanent rank of major; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 12081) granting an increase of pension to Dwight F. Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12082) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 12083) to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co. a portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 12084) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 12085) granting a pension to John L. Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12086) granting a pension to Mary Wessel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 12087) granting a pension to Richard Oddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 12088) granting a pension to Ella E. Carbonell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 12089) granting a pension to Anna Redding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12090) granting a pension to Flora A. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 12091) granting a pension to Kessiah Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12092) granting a pension to John Van Dyne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12093) granting a pension to Lloyd Newell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12094) granting an increase of pension to William L. Snider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 12095) granting a pension to Joseph Stocker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12096) granting a pension to Elizabeth Schiemann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12097) granting an increase of pension to Henry Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 12098) for the relief of Annie M. Eopolucci; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1113. By the SPEAKER: Petition of City Council of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging Congress to make sufficient appropriation for the early completion of the improvement of the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1114. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of Texas City Post, No. 89, American Legion, indorsing the Davey sedition bill, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1115. Also, petition of the National Association of Commissioners and Departments of Agriculture, opposing the repeal of certain features of Federal farm and joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1116. Also, petition of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, relative to better understanding between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1117. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of sundry citizens from the State of Ohio, regarding railroad legislation now before Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1118. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the National Association of Chewing Gum Manufacturers and Allied Trades of New York City, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1119. Also, petition of W. C. Whish, John E. Gray, Thomas E. Ryan, and John Fitzgibbons, representatives of the four great railroad organizations, opposing the Cummins and Esch railroad bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1120. Also, petition of the United Restaurant Owners of Greater New York, relative to the treatment of Jews of the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1121. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1122. By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of the Robert Emmet Literary Association, of Fall River, Mass., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1123. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of the Women's Welfare Club of Marquette, Mich., relative to certain legislation in regard to the cold storage of food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1124. By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of Oklahoma Employees' Associations, favoring legislation that will prevent the production and exhibition of any picture purporting to show the impersonation of any desperado, bandit, train robber, or alleged outlaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1125. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Muskegon National Farm Loan Association at its annual meeting held January 13, 1920, protesting against the increase of maximum loans under Federal farm-loan act, also protesting against the taxing of Government farm-loan bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1126. By Mr. MAHER: Petition of W. C. Whish, John E. Gray, Thomas E. Ryan, and John Fitzgibbons, representatives of the four great railroad organizations, opposing the Esch and Cummins railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1127. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1128. By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of the Carpenters' Union, No. 483, of San Francisco, Calif., against the unseating of Victor Berger; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

1129. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1130. Also, petition of the National Association of Chewing Gum Manufacturers of New York, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1131. Also, petition of W. C. Whish, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Thomas E. Ryan, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; John E. Gray, Order of Railway Conductors; and John Fitzgibbons, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, opposing the Esch and Cummins railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1132. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of J. B. Murray and D. H. Gould, of Yonkers, N. Y., regarding the peace treaty and the League of Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1133. Also, petition of Association of State Farmers' Union Presidents, regarding the interest of farmers and the demands of organized labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1134. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, regarding proposed relief to manufacturers and importers from results of demoralization in customs service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1135. Also, petition of the National Association of Chewing Gum Manufacturers of New York relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1136. Also, petition of the United Restaurant Owners of Greater New York, relative to the treatment of the Jews of the Ukraine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1137. Also, petition of H. A. Paterson, of New York, favoring all provisions in the Esch-Cummins railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1138. Also, petition of W. S. Price, of New York City, opposing certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1139. By Mr. VAILE: Petition of the Canon City (Colo.) Lodge, No. 610, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1140. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of the Rotary Club of Parkersburg, W. Va., relative to the "red" menace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.